

large

7504

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

OCTOBER 1952

PRINCIPALS' INSTITUTE—1952

VALUE OF LIFE ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS

EVALUATIONS OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS

Vol. XV, No. 2

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Contributors

FATHER ROMAN A. BERNERT, Principal of Rockhurst High School and member of the Commission on Secondary Schools summarizes the pros and cons submitted by Jesuit college deans of Jesuit high schools as college preparatory institutions.

FATHER TRAFFORD P. MAHER, Instructor of Education at Saint Louis University, by reason of his close association with leading exponents of Life Adjustment Education, is especially qualified to examine its value and pertinence to our high schools.

FATHER WILLIAM J. MEHOK, Assistant to the Executive Director of the Jesuit Educational Association and Managing Editor of the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, summarizes very briefly the proceedings of this year's Principals' Institute.

FATHER JOHN F. SULLIVAN, Principal of the University of Detroit High School and Chairman of the Commission on Secondary Schools, interprets the reactions of alumni of ten years ago to their Jesuit high school training.

FATHER BERNARD J. WUELLNER, Associate Professor of Philosophy at Xavier University, expounds a significant trend made in introducing religion into the college curriculum, the Hazen Foundation project.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

October 1952

CONTENTS

J. E. A. PRINCIPALS' INSTITUTE:

REGIS—DENVER, 1952

William J. Mebok, S.J. 69

VALUE AND PERTINENCE OF LIFE ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS

Trafford P. Maher, S.J. 79

JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL: ALUMNI EVALUATION

John F. Sullivan, S.J. 88

COLLEGE DEANS EVALUATE JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS

Roman A. Bernert, S.J. 107

RELIGIOUS PERSPECTIVES OF COLLEGE TEACHING

Bernard Wuellner, S.J. 114

NEWS FROM THE FIELD 121

THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, October, January, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States, and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign lands

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

Managing Editor

WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J.

Advisory Board

An editorial advisory board is composed of the regional directors of education in the several Jesuit provinces:

EDWARD B. BUNN, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
DAVID R. DRAHAN, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>
HUGH M. DUCE, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
EUGENE F. GALLAGHER, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
JOHN F. LENNY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
WILFRED M. MALLON, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
ARTHUR J. SHEEHAN, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
WILLIAM E. WELLER, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 EAST 84TH STREET

NEW YORK 28, N. Y.

COPYRIGHT, OCTOBER 1952
JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

J. E. A. Principals' Institute

Regis—Denver, 1952

WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J.

For the second time in six years Regis College, Denver, Colorado acted as host to the Jesuit Educational Association Principals' Institute as 71 representatives of all the Jesuit high schools of the Assistancy gathered for deliberations on practical high-school administrative problems from August 4-14, 1952. Included among the delegates were principals and assistant principals of high schools, province prefects of studies, the Executive Director of the Association and his assistant, student counsellors, and special delegates including two principals of the English speaking Canadian Province.

Father Raphael C. McCarthy, President of Regis, previously the gracious and generous host of the Deans' Institute outdid himself in his welcoming address at the opening session of the Institute. For the rest of that and the following sessions of two hours, morning and afternoon, the intention of the Institute's moderator, Father Lorenzo K. Reed, in conjunction with his co-organizer, Father Eugene F. Gallagher, the sessions were directed along these lines. All participants were expected to have studied the contents of the *Manual for Jesuit High School Administrators* prepared in advance by Father Reed assisted by a subcommittee of General Prefects. Premising this knowledge, participants were to supplement, corroborate or revise the content of this Manual and go beyond it in suggesting practical methods and procedures to be followed in the actual conduct of the school. Needless to say the bracing air of Denver and the occasional excursions into the mountains contributed towards the well-being of the delegates.

After a brief introduction by the chairman, Father Reed, the first topic for discussion was practical and useful procedures for analyzing results of examinations. Father William Mehok began by outlining the efforts of the Missouri Province in the validation of freshman entrance tests. The point brought out in the discussion was the applicability of the technique to school and other province situations. Although it is laborious in the beginning, the user can build up a reservoir of such tests which, when rotated, will predict achievement of a known, not merely conjectured, value. Father Vincent McGrail explained the technique and results of a rank-correlation study of the relation between scores and

entrance intelligence and achievement tests and general average at the end of the first year. The commendable aspect of the study is the fact that it gives a graphic predictive instrument without the application of intricate statistical knowledge. Finally, Father Reed demonstrated a technique for validating non-standardized examinations by item analysis. In addition to showing the discriminating power of test questions, the analysis is also useful in diagnosing the strengths and weaknesses of students as well as teachers.

Realizing the need of cost accounting for the effective management of a school, Father Reed sketched in broadest outline the steps to be followed, and introduced the delegates to a minimum but adequate bibliography. Besides the fact that information so gathered can point out areas of inefficiency and waste, the public relations value was stressed especially when a school is confronted with the need of expansion or increase in tuition.

The Denver Principals' Institute of 1946 outlined a program for introducing remedial reading into the schedule. It was encouraging to hear reported the success of various schools which found such programs successful. Father Donald Kirsch explained the program obtaining at Canisius High School and the success achieved there, surpassing expectation, through a well planned and intelligently executed procedure. Availing itself of community, diocesan, and private remedial reading clinics, St. Louis University High School faced the problem from a different approach according to Father James Corrigan. Though somewhat more costly to the student, this procedure was found very satisfactory. In addition to the usually recommended methods, Father Philip Moriarty suggested several others than can be employed with less serious remedial cases even outside of a formal course. Though some remained cool to the promises of remedial work, the evidence adduced by delegates having serious programs dispelled most doubts and showed that many failing students could be saved.

Father Jerome Boyle presented the problems connected with the official ranking of students. Chiefly they arose from the possible injustice in more difficult courses. Though there was no unanimity, in addition to straight ranking of all graduates, the possibility of ranking within courses and the weighting of the ranks of graduates in more difficult courses was presented as a solution by some of the delegates.

When the program called for practical solutions to the problem of homogeneous grouping, none were so naive as to think that they were forthcoming. Father Francis Carty favored moderate homogeneous grouping for the larger school while Father Robert Walet presented the limita-

tions in a small school. When an informal poll was taken of the delegates, none favored heterogeneous grouping, a few favored putting the best students in one class, the worst in another and scattering the rest heterogeneously, while almost equally divided were those in favor of complete homogeneity and those putting the best in the top class and scattering the rest throughout the remaining sections.

With no intent at reflecting on the excellent work of their teachers, the principals realized that teachers' effort can be made more effective by an intelligent program of faculty stimulation. Father William Graham outlined the need and divisions of an effective program, with stress on the advisability of a different approach to the priest, scholastic, and lay teacher. Father Robert Boggs cited methods for priest teachers to advance and improve in efficiency by means of courses, publications, and attendance at professional meetings and conventions. Though scholastics, according to Father Kevin Scott, Montreal, Canada, are more limited in their mobility, many local opportunities present themselves to keep up a lively professional interest. The discussion brought out the school-sponsored retreat for the lay faculty to deepen spiritual motivation, and, on the academic level, the presenting of their names to serve on visiting evaluating committees.

Father John Convery enunciated the basic principle for our admissions policy: Do not admit a student unless we have evidence he can profit by one of our courses. In any departure from this ideal, as in pressure cases, the principal should make it clear to the parent that the odds are against the student and that he is admitted conditionally. Father Francis Gilday reviewed the steps in the process of selection, while Father Claude Stallworth followed up with means for recruiting deserving and often needy students, namely, scholarships, grants-in-aid, and loans. Since Father Francis Harrington was just starting his new school in Phoenix, Arizona, he did not report though he participated in discussions.

Father Patrick Clear commented on the causes of failure as given in the *Manual*, while Father William Corvi suggested remedies along lines of motivation and method. Father Vincent Watson dropped a potential bombshell when he raised some questions, prime among them, the realism of demanding three hours of homework. Briefly, premising a sound policy of admission, theoretically all should pass. Consequent upon Original Sin, this ideal is never reached, but, through good motivation and the inculcation of sound study habits along with remedial work, we can come closer to its realization.

The concept of the condition differs in East and West. Father Paul Swick summarized the Eastern notion as another examination, while Father

James Eatough outlined the Western concept as a state of being in continuation subjects, and another examination in non-continuation subjects. Father Edward Curry concluded by stating that there were solid bases for both concepts and that uniformity was undesirable at present. The discussion brought out the fact that, in view of the many unsolved difficulties involved in either concept, a poll of opinion was inadvisable.

The functions that any grade, whether it be letter or percentage, are to fulfill is to help in administration, guidance, give information, and provide motivation. According to Father Cornelius Carr, the guidance and administrative purposes are not fulfilled by grades as they are employed today, since they are not based on an objective standard. Father Patrick Devlin explained the pros and cons of letter grades, while Father Thomas Murray did likewise for the percentage grade system. The discussion indicated the possibility of validating grades through use of the services of the National Registration Office.

Since we, as teachers, are delegates of parents in matters educational, we have an obligation to report on their sons' progress. Father William Ryan stressed the point that these reports be pertinent and timely not only for the generality of students but also for the supplementary deficiency reports and special letters. Father Carl Kloster collected an exhibit of forms currently used by our schools and stressed that they should be simple and aim at a public uninitiated in educational terminology. Father Raymond Grant explained the advantages of the I.B.M. system of reporting. By means of it, grade studies and ranking are performed with great facility and speed.

Father St. Clair Monaghan, Winnipeg, Canada, outlined the general principles underlying training in study habits which Father John Rossing followed up with a plan employed in his school based on the manual *Do it Right* by Father Paul A. Reed. Father Peter Daly explained with great interest to the delegates a plan he introduced for acquainting juniors and seniors with the college lecture method which, when properly followed up, proves invaluable to students during their early college days. Father Henry Sullivan, opening with an eloquent tribute to the Institute, drew on his more than twenty-years experience as principal to close this most important section.

Father Christopher McDonnell, aided by Father William Troy, reported on the pros and cons of homework. All were agreed on its value, but discussion revolved around the problem of distributing the assignments so that the over-ambitious teacher does not monopolize too much of the students' time.

Father Roman Bernert, reporting for his hard-working committee of

Fathers John P. Foley, Michael Kennelly, and Francis Saussothe, supplied the delegates with a draft outline of a basic teachers' manual. It was discussed and revisions were suggested and incorporated in an outline which might form the table of contents for a manual which a school might wish to publish.

Emphasis on man's duty to his fellow is the current need in our training of apostles as Father John Sullivan outlined in his introductory talk on the application of Father General's letter on the Social Apostolate. Father Michael Blee observed that much advancement has been made in the theoretical order of our knowledge of the social program of the Church and problems of our present age, but that much is left to be accomplished in the application of these truths, even in our own schools. Father James Powers dealt specifically with the means of applying social teachings to the present curricular and extra-curricular setup of our high schools.

Guidance, according to Father Robert Rebhahn, to be properly organized must be divided among the chief participating officers: the principal, in supplying over-all leadership; the student counsellor in bringing to his job professional competence; and the class advisors in contributing their interest and enthusiasm. Father Ralph Schenk, after paying highest tribute to the Guidance Institute, went on to say that the Jesuit informal guidance program has been and still is very good. Modern requirements of college and industry demand a more careful keeping of records. Valuable assets to the school are the community resources available, such as the Red Cross, vocational and rehabilitation services, speech clinics, and employment services. Father Thomas Harvey outlined the two most prevalent home room guidance programs, the St. Ignatius (Chicago) and Scranton programs. Their success depends on a functional syllabus, competent advisors, and an interested faculty.

The Institute is indebted to its only guest lecturer, Father Raymond Bishop, Director of the St. Louis University Film Library, for his balanced appraisal of audio-visual aids and their application to Jesuit high schools. Their worth is proportionate to the preparation and follow-up on the part of the teacher. Father Charles Mehok took up the matter of the practical introduction of an audio-visual program into the school schedule. Campion has had a trained and enthusiastic man in charge of its program. Any teacher goes to him with his request for audio-visual aids to meet a specific need and he, in turn, tries to locate them. If he is successful, teacher and director go over their discovery with critical eye or ear and accept or reject it on its merits. The discussion was brief but fruitful. The applicability of such aids to the physical and social sciences was demonstrated,

but in other areas, the pooled experience of many teachers is needed to select good films along with some practical method of handing down to others knowledge of the success of their quest.

The 1946 Principals' Institute suggested the desirability of specialists or quasi-specialists in the areas of remedial reading, guidance, and testing. The first two have been supplied for the most part, but the last function has devolved upon the principal. In the section dealing with a comprehensive testing program for Jesuit high schools, Father Thomas McKenney treated the selection of tests for admission, laying down the "tantum quantum" rule for their use. Father John F. Hurley dealt with tests for guidance and counselling, placing emphasis on the setup prevalent in his school. The third major class of tests in a comprehensive plan, achievement tests, was treated under the headings of placement, promotion, and diagnostic tests, by Father Eugene Mangold. Father Edward Donahue participated in the committee meetings but did not report.

Treating problems of discipline, Father William Bauer outlined its purpose as moral discipline and the environment for instilling individual responsibility. Father William Berdan handled extraordinary penalties. These, he stated, are of little value, or even of great harm, to the problem boy who is a problem to himself, or to the boy who lacks ability for our course, or who is forced to attend against his will. It is only in the case of the boy who has no discernible reason for his rebellious behavior that such penalties as suspension and expulsion are effective. Father Francis Duffy stressed the prime importance of the reasonableness of the command and the character training aspect of discipline. Father James McWilliam described in detail the technique of disciplinary probation for serious offenses. In a situation where students are liable for expulsion but in which neither the boy nor the school would benefit by expulsion, this means was attempted. Complete details were gathered from independent sources including the persons involved; the parents were called in and presented the whole picture and were told that the matter made their son liable for expulsion. A formal document of probation was drawn up and signed by the parents specifying conditions of supervision of their sons' conduct and reporting to school authority, the breach of which merited automatic expulsion. In favor of this procedure is the fact that it corrected the boy and the parents and it provided public sanction and increased cooperation of school and parents. The long range effects of this procedure have not yet been noted. Though discipline is often looked upon as negative and penal, the discussion and the reports emphasized the position, constructive, and character-building aspects which should never be overlooked.

The purposes of the extracurricular program, according to Father James Farrell, are to supplement the curriculum and to develop student spirit or morale. The norm for appraising the worth of the various activities is the extent to which they develop desirable qualities in students in a less academic way or, at least, in one not opposed to the academic program. Father William Farricker stressed the importance and means of recording such activities. Whereas much importance is placed on extracurricular activities by the school, and knowledge of a student's participation is considered of great value in education and vocational guidance, very often the only evidence available is the student's word or the memory of the frequently replaced moderator. A simple card, filled out by the student, signed by the moderator, and recorded by the principal's office would effectively and without too great burden make such a record available. Father William Finnegan, basing his comments on experience, presented the pros and cons of an activity period. Granting many advantages, the administrative problems involved in making the program flexible make the activity period almost impracticable.

The final topic on the Institute's agenda in a manner also summed up much that had been treated in detail. Effective promotion of unity of purpose and unity of methods in our high schools was divided according to its bearing on faculty, students, and parents. Father Charles Burke treated the principal's job with relation to his faculty. The principal, by his leadership, must inspire and evoke teamwork from his teachers. This is possible only at the cost of much labor evoked by devotion to his job. Father William Fay stressed many aspects relating to the student which had already been handled, the reduction of failure, a good guidance program, and, one not treated, the students' handbook. Father Gerard Fagan suggested means for winning the good will and cooperation of parents. They are ultimately responsible for our staying in business. Our best advertisement is our product, but, apart from expecting it to speak for itself, we must institute a sound policy of public relations. Parents' clubs, the principal's letter, personal interviews, are but some of the ways he can reach parents.

By way of summary, it might seem at first glance that this third principal's institute was somewhat disorganized in the topics treated. One must remember that the time allotted was limited, a scant eleven days. Much of the groundwork had been laid in July 1940 at the West Baden Principals' Institute. The JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY for October 1946, pp. 77-84, reprinted its "General Statement of Philosophy of the American Jesuit High School." Being a classic of precision and acumen, there was little need of going over the same ground.

Again in 1946, the principals met at Denver to discuss more proximate objectives. The mimeographed proceedings of this meeting, along with the record of the sessions which appeared in the July 1946 *JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY* (pp. 69-76) provided more background for the two-thirds of the delegates to the 1952 Institute who had not attended its predecessor.

Building steadily on these two institutes and the wealth of published materials collected in the *Manual for Jesuit High School Administrators*, the 1952 Institute could presuppose as adequately treated many of the problems confronting the busy principal. It was with this in mind that the principals were polled at the 1952 annual meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association to select areas of greater urgency to be explored further.

No one who has taken the trouble to examine the 1946 proceedings is ignorant of the positive steps taken as a result of its proposals. Is it not inconceivable that much benefit will come as a consequence of these latest discussions held in 1952?

Apart from demonstrable benefits, many problems have been solved and a better understanding has been engendered as a result of the informal interchange of ideas.

Jesuit Priests Participating in the Jesuit Educational Association Principals' Institute Regis College, Denver, Colorado, August 4-14, 1952:

- BAUER, WILLIAM J., S.J., Student Counsellor, Canisius High, Buffalo, N. Y.
 BERDAN, WILLIAM H., S.J., Ass't Principal, St. Xavier High School, Cincinnati, O.
 BERNERT, ROMAN A., S.J., Principal, Rockhurst High School, Kansas City, Mo.
 BLEE, MICHAEL J., S.J., Principal, Loyola High School, Baltimore, Md.
 BOGGS, ROBERT L., S.J., Ass't Principal, Jesuit High School, New Orleans, La.
 BOYLE, JEROME T., S.J., Ass't Principal, Marquette University High School, Milwaukee, Wis.
 BURKE, CHARLES E., S.J., Principal, Cramwell Preparatory School, Lenox, Mass.
 CARLIN, HARRY J., S.J., Vice-Principal, Loyola High School, Los Angeles, Calif.
 CARR, CORNELIUS J., S.J., Tertianship, Auriesville, N. Y.
 CARTY, FRANCIS X., S.J., Principal, Fairfield College Preparatory School, Fairfield, Conn.
 CLEAR, PATRICK F., S.J., Ass't Principal, University of Detroit High School, Detroit, Mich.
 CONVERY, JOHN A., S.J., Headmaster, Scranton Preparatory School, Scranton, Pa.
 CORRIGAN, JAMES B., S.J., Ass't Principal, St. Louis University High School, St. Louis, Mo.
 CORVI, WILLIAM P., S.J., Principal, Bellarmine College Preparatory, San Jose, Calif.
 CURRY, EDWARD P., S.J., Principal, Jesuit High, Dallas, Texas
 DALY, PETER J., S.J., Headmaster, Loyola School, New York, N. Y.
 DEVLIN, PATRICK L., S.J., Principal, Marquette High, Yakima, Wash.

- DONAHUE, EDWARD F., S.J., Principal, Cheverus High School, Portland, Me.
DRUHAN, DAVID R., S.J., Province Prefect, New Orleans Province.
DUFFY, FRANCIS, S.J., Ass't Principal, Bellarmine High School, Tacoma, Wash.
- EATOUGH, JAMES R., S.J., Principal, Regis High School, Denver, Colo.
EDWARDS, LAWRENCE E., S.J., Principal, Holy Rosary Mission, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.
- FAGAN, GERARD F., S.J., Principal, Xavier High School, New York, N. Y.
FARRELL, JAMES E., S.J., Principal, Loyola Academy, Chicago, Ill.
FARRICKER, WILLIAM J., S.J., Principal, Fordham Preparatory School, New York, N. Y.
FAY, WILLIAM F., S.J., Principal, St. Xavier High School, Cincinnati, O.
FINNEGAN, WILLIAM J., S.J., Principal, St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco, Calif.
FOLEY, JOHN P., S.J., Principal, Boston College High School, Boston, Mass.
- GALLAGHER, EUGENE F., S.J., Assistant to Province Prefect, Missouri Province
GILDAY, FRANCIS T., S.J., Ass't Principal, Boston College High School, Boston, Mass.
GRAHAM, WILLIAM F., S.J., Principal, St. Joseph's College High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
GRANT, RAYMOND T., S.J., Principal, St. Ignatius High School, Chicago, Ill.
- HARRINGTON, FRANCIS J., S.J., Principal, Brophy College Preparatory, Phoenix, Ariz.
HARVEY, THOMAS M., S.J., Principal, Regis High School, New York, N. Y.
HURLEY, JOHN F., S.J., Ass't Principal, Gonzaga High, Spokane, Wash.
- KENNELLY, MICHAEL F., S.J., Principal, St. John's High School, Shreveport, La.
KIRSCH, DONALD L., S.J., Principal, Canisius High School, Buffalo, N. Y.
KLOSTER, CHARLES G., S.J., Principal, Campion, Prairie du Chien, Wis.
- LENNY, JOHN F., S.J., Province Prefect, Maryland Province
- MALINE, JULIAN L., S.J., Province Prefect, Chicago Province
MANGOLD, EUGENE F., S.J., Ass't Principal, St. Ignatius High School, Chicago, Ill.
McDONNELL, CHRISTOPHER, S.J., Rector-Principal, Seattle Preparatory School, Seattle, Wash.
- McGRAIL, VINCENT J., S.J., Tertianship, Auriesville, N. Y.
McKENNEY, THOMAS K., S.J., Principal, Marquette University High School, Milwaukee, Wis.
- McWILLIAM, JAMES J., S.J., Ass't Principal, Loyola Academy, Chicago, Ill.
MEHOK, CHARLES J., S.J., Ass't Principal, Campion, Prairie du Chien, Wis.
MEHOK, WILLIAM J., S.J., Assistant to Executive Director, Jesuit Educational Association, New York, N. Y.
- MONAGHAN, ST. CLAIR, S.J., Principal, St. Paul's College, Winnipeg, Canada
MORIARTY, PHILIP D., S.J., Ass't Principal, Fairfield College Preparatory School, Fairfield, Conn.
- MURRAY, THOMAS F., S.J., Principal, St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland, O.
- O'NEILL, LAWRENCE, M., S.J., Rector, Jesuit High School, New Orleans, La.
- PERRI, JOSEPH E., S.J., Oregon Province
PLUSHKELL, ROBERT B., S.J., Ass't Principal, Bellarmine College Preparatory, San Jose, Calif.
- POWERS, JAMES E., S.J., Ass't Principal, Cheverus High School, Portland, Me.

- REBHAHN, ROBERT J., S.J., Principal, Loyola High School, Missoula, Mont.
- REED, LORENZO K., S.J., Province Prefect for High Schools, New York Province
- ROONEY, EDWARD B., S.J., Executive Director Jesuit Educational Association, New York, N. Y.
- ROSSING, JOHN J., S.J., Ass't Principal, St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland, O.
- RYAN, WILLIAM A., S.J., Rector-Headmaster, Georgetown Preparatory School, Garrett Park, Md.
- SAUSSOTTE, FRANCIS P., S.J., Principal, Loyola High School, Los Angeles, Calif.
- SCHENK, RALPH H., S.J., Principal, St. Louis University High School, St. Louis, Mo.
- SCOTT, KEVIN J., S.J., Prefect of Studies, Loyola High School, Montreal, Canada
- SHEEHAN, ARTHUR J., S.J., Province Prêfct for High Schools, New England Province
- SHINNERS, CHARLES T., S.J., Ass't Principal, Creighton University High School, Omaha, Nebr.
- STALLWORTH, CLAUDE J., S.J., Principal, Jesuit High, New Orleans, La.
- SULLIVAN, HENRY L., S.J., Principal, Creighton University High School, Omaha, Nebr.
- SULLIVAN, JOHN F., S.J., Principal, University of Detroit High School, Detroit, Mich.
- SWICK, PAUL J., S.J., Principal, St. Peter's College High School, Jersey City, N. J.
- TROY, WILLIAM F., S.J., Principal, Gonzaga High School, Washington, D. C.
- WALET, ROBERT E., S.J., Rector-Principal, Jesuit High School, Tampa, Fla.
- WATSON, J. VINCENT, S.J., Headmaster, Brooklyn Preparatory School, Brooklyn, N. Y.
- WELLER, WILLIAM M., S.J., Province Prefect, Oregon Province

Value and Pertinence of Life Adjustment Programs

TRAFFORD P. MAHER, S.J.¹

Not a new label but an increasingly more emphatic label has entered the thinking and writing of public and Catholic educators today. "V For Victory!" was a motto to be reckoned with during the war years. "Life Adjustment For Utopia" is a similar force to be faced on the educational scene today. How did it all get started?

It has long been a cherished hope of the American school system to make secondary education quite as much the common heritage of youth as elementary education. Despite all efforts to universalize secondary education, figures for 1947-1948 showed that only about seven youths out of ten enter high school and fewer than five of them remain to graduate.¹ Many problems enter in as deterrents to high-school attendance: The need or the desire to help earn an income; lack of funds, clothing, or similar personal problems of the pupils; inaccessibility of suitable schools and courses of instruction having sufficient meaning, value, and appeal to the pupils and their parents to overcome deterrents to high-school attendance. It was with this last factor in focus—namely, the development, try-out, and spread of programs of instruction which will have greater value, meaning, and appeal to more of the youth of high-school age—which led to the institution of the Life Adjustment Programs.

Following upon a national conference of educators in Chicago in May of 1947, which had been held under the directorship of John W. Studebaker, then United States Commissioner of Education, a Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth was established.² The Commission, made up of representatives of nine national educational organizations, held its first meeting in Washington in December of 1947. The National Catholic Welfare Conference, one of the nine organizations making up the new Commission, appointed as its representative, Sister Mary Janet, S.C., from the Commission on American Citizenship of Catholic University of America.³

The Commission on American Citizenship came into being on the occasion of the Jubilee Celebration of The Catholic University of America

¹Delivered at the Jesuit Educational Association Annual Meeting, Secondary School Session, Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Missouri, April 14, 1952.

in 1938. The Holy Father had stated a mandate "to evolve a constructive social program based on Christian principles which would command the respect and admiration of all right thinking men." The Catholic University of America was charged with carrying out the program under the direction and sponsorship of the Bishops of America.

This indicates how the National Program for Life Adjustment Education ties in with The Catholic University's program on American Citizenship. As all are aware, Sister Mary Janet is the most prominent spokesman for the Catholic program.

What then is Life Adjustment Education? When the Commission was asked this question, they answered by saying:

The purpose of the Commission shall be to promote in every manner possible ways, means, and devices for improving the life adjustment education of secondary school youth.⁴

It placed its emphasis upon action; concern for all youth with special concern for the neglected youth; home, work, citizenship. In the enumeration of the guiding principles of life adjustment education, the Commission referred to the criteria which were approved and developed at the Work Conference held in Washington in October 1948. These principles state that the Commission:

1. Respects individual worth and personality
2. Enrolls and retains all youth
3. Requires courses and course content concerned with problems of living
4. Emphasizes direct experience
5. Believes that planning, organization, operation, and administration are Democratic
6. Proposes that records and data be used constructively
7. Maintains that evaluation is for desirable changes in pupil behavior⁵

As the work of the Commission progressed, it became clear that its members were using as their criteria for curriculum planning the National Association of Secondary School Principals' statement of the Ten Imperative Needs of Youth.⁶ This listing had largely replaced the Seven Cardinal Principles which had been formulated in 1918.

The Commission on Life Adjustment Education looked upon itself as unique in so far as its major responsibility is that of translating into action recommendations contained in reports which other commissions or committees have made.⁷

Further, the Commission in lining up the obstacles to its progress, listed as a major difficulty the influence of the college in giving prestige

to traditional subjects and procedures. The influence selected for special attention was that of the schools which look upon the classical language tradition as being more respectable than household arts and vocational crafts. The small school, too, was listed as a stumbling block since it offers only one curriculum and that, the college preparatory program.⁸

The Catholic agent emphasizing views of the Life Adjustment Education has been the Commission on American Citizenship. Its statement of Principles explained⁹ that education for Christian social living means guiding the child in his development of attitudes, knowledge, and actions concerning his relationship to God, Church, Fellowman, Nature, Self, through the continual development of the intellect by means of Religion, Science, Social Studies, Language Arts, Fine Arts, Reading, Library, Oral and Written Communication, and Mathematics. This program is to be united to the continual strengthening of the will with the aid of Grace and the development of Christian Virtue. All this aimed at expressing itself in Christian Social Living as manifested in Physical Fitness, Economic Competence, Social Virtue, Cultural Development and Moral Perfection.

Sister Mary Janet has further elaboration of the general theme in the Bulletin of the N.C.E.A.¹⁰ She stresses the need for courses that achieve better social living through the development of social virtues. Courses, therefore, that help achieve this goal are of major importance.

Major Assumptions, Propositions, and Recommendations of the Proponents and Designers of Life Adjustment Programs. The major thesis of both programs, that is, the Life Adjustment Group and the Commission on American Citizenship Group, is that the school must meet the needs of modern youth. The school is said to be one of the important institutions which exercise educational influence, and as such must assume its full share of responsibility for the behavior of adults.¹¹ It is apparent, contends the Commission,¹² that American adults are sorely tried in their efforts to solve the problems forced upon them by the conditions of modern living. Upon those who have a faith that schools can and do make a contribution to intelligent adult behavior, there rests an obligation for improving the schools.¹³ The school must meet the needs of youth through the curriculum in order to prepare them for life.

Dr. Robert Havighurst, one of the leading spokesmen for the Life Adjustment Program, states that youths' needs are indicated by the developmental tasks that our society puts upon them.¹⁴ He lists eight developmental tasks: (a) acceptance of one's physique—the male and female roles and their respective consequences; (b) learning more and more mature relations with agemates of both sexes; (c) emotional inde-

pendence of parents and other adults—psychological weaning; (d) selecting and preparing for an occupation; (e) acquiring intellectual skills and concepts necessary for our society in order to be a good citizen; (f) desiring and achieving socially acceptable behavior; (g) preparing for marriage and family life; (h) building conscious values in harmony with an adequate scientific world—that is, a philosophy of life.

The Commission of American Citizenship implies that the traditional school curriculum does not and cannot prepare modern youth to live in modern society. It proposes that the curriculum be adjusted along the lines of the recommendations contained in the Life Adjustment Programs, with this difference that Catholic education will always emphasize its primary purpose above all others. This commission has finished its work on curricular changes for the elementary school¹⁵ and is now working on the secondary school curriculum. The basis for recommending curricular changes at the secondary school level is the secondary school survey conducted by Sister Mary Janet.¹⁶

The Manner in which Life Adjustment Programs Pertain to the Various Types of Schools. The major pertinence is that the traditional school, public and Catholic, has been designated as a stumbling block to the Life Adjustment Program.¹⁷ The classical academic curriculum is looked upon as particularly unrealistic. Another implication is that school systems up to date have conducted persistent but largely unsystematized appraisals of their work. Emphasis is placed upon the fact that there are readily available criteria for judging the effectiveness of traditional courses. School patrons and the public generally can easily determine whether or not students are being successfully prepared for college.¹⁸ The same circumstances do not obtain when inquiry is made whether the school is effectively preparing students for non-college life in the areas of citizenship, family life, conservation, general occupational adjustment, consumer education, leisure time, and health. The Commission recognizes these difficulties and has no panacea for overcoming them.¹⁹ It has no single pattern for improvement. However, it is convinced that over the United States many effective efforts are being made. Some of these efforts are in the traditional framework under traditional subject-matter labels. Other such efforts are included in core or common-learning programs. Some are in the extra-curriculum, and some are in community schools. Characteristic of all these endeavors is an emphasis on the influencing of behavior and the building of better personal and community living.

Rev. Thomas A. Lawless, O.S.F.S., has stated what he feels could be the contribution that Catholic religious education can make to the Life Adjustment Program. He stresses self-discipline through religious moti-

vation as a practical basis for Life Adjustment Education.²⁰

An Evaluation of Life Adjustment Education Programs and their Implications for Jesuit Secondary Education in American Culture. Proponents of Life Adjustment Education point to the fact that over the country approximately eighty percent of youth enter the ninth grade; approximately forty percent remain to be graduated from high schools.²¹ Obviously this is a factor to be faced. Educators will certainly do well to expand their energies in trying to remedy this situation. In a democracy where an enlightened citizenry is a must, the best possible opportunities for learning must be afforded the adolescents of the country. The public school and the parochial school are faced with the need to re-evaluate their curriculum to ascertain whether or not it can be given greater "holding power."

The case of the specialized private school, the situation is somewhat different. Just as the President's Commission on Higher Education pointed out that liberal arts colleges are absolutely necessary in a democracy as citadels of free thought;²² so specialized secondary schools are needed to prepare students for entrance into liberal arts colleges and the professions that depend upon the liberal arts colleges to prepare their students for specialization.

Sociologists tell us that whenever a societal institution is threatened, it has several choices in planning its reaction: (a) it can withdraw; (b) it can imitate; (c) it can specialize. Obviously there is no question of the traditional secondary school's withdrawing. It not only has proved itself repeatedly; it has won ample support and commendation. When a new educational movement enthusiastically pushes ahead making immature claims for its merits, attention is distracted, and it would almost seem that all school programs not conforming to the new movement are *ipso facto* outmoded. Care must be taken lest the institution under attack begin to feel so insecure that its own efficiency is cut down.

The matter is not so simple when one asks whether or not the threatened institution should imitate the aggressor. In the case of educational institutions, it certainly is incumbent upon the threatened institution to examine its function and to make sure that it is not allowing routine to slow its efficiency. In the process, undoubtedly, many wholesome adjustments will be made which are in no sense an imitation of the aggressor or threatened force. Imitation, apparently, is not a sound policy; however, re-evaluation using the aggressor as a stimulus would seem to be a sound plan of action.

The third course of action open to the threatened institution is that of specialization. If its original purpose was unique, and if that purpose

has been repeatedly judged to be sound, then a further specialization of its function would seem to be in order.

Jesuit Secondary Schools are traditional academic institutions. Along with other such institutions, they are under the critical eye of those who contend that the traditional curriculum does not meet the needs of modern youth.

In standing the critical tests suggested by the new movement, Jesuit Secondary Schools have several statements to make: The primary purpose of a Jesuit Secondary School is definite and specialized—that purpose is largely realized. It is roughly estimated that about eighty-five percent of Jesuit secondary school graduates go on to college. This indicates how well the schools implement their purpose. About ninety-four to ninety-six percent of the freshmen of each year go on to sophomore year. Ninety-six to ninety-eight percent remain to graduate. Therefore, the school's purpose is achieved; its clientele is served accordingly.

General Summary and Brief Recommendations. Life Adjustment Programs were set in motion about 1947. These programs resulted from a deep conviction that the traditional schools were not serving the needs of youth and that changes would have to be made to remedy this difficulty. The Catholic schools became actively involved in this movement when a representative of The Commission on American Citizenship became a member of the planning committee of The Life Adjustment Programs.

Ultimately, whether or not the Life Adjustment people advert to it, the basis of the entire controversy is the old problem of transfer of training. What learnings shall be furnished in the secondary school years to prepare a person for his adult life? What types of learning yield a maximum of transfer to life situations in the adolescent and adult years?

In his most recent book,²³ Dr. Lee J. Cronbach of the University of Illinois, has digested the most modern research data on the transfer of learning:

Implications of Transfer Studies

The search for methods promoting transfer has demonstrated five types of learning which contribute to adaptation and readiness to learn in new situations:

- (a) The student learns specific reactions which can be used whenever any future situation is much like the one where the reaction was specifically learned. . . .
- (b) The student learns more effective methods: better ways of attacking problems, of studying, or organizing his thoughts, of communicating with others.
- (c) The student learns concepts and generalizations . . . which

apply to life situations.

- (d) The student learns attitudes toward work . . . and progress in every subject will be facilitated when the student is aware that for real understanding in explanation or an argument must be read intensively and critically, rather than once-over-lightly like a best seller.
- (e) The student learns new attitudes toward himself.

Both adolescent life and adult life are freighted with new learning situations. Any curriculum which helps facilitate constructive adjustment in the new learning situations is achieving the goals of Life Adjustment Education. The Jesuit secondary school curriculum offers a practical means of acquiring each of the five types of learning which are said to furnish maximum transfer to new situations.

Recommendations: It is suggested:

1. that Jesuit secondary school catalogs, brochures, folders and writings in other publications present clearly and realistically forthright statements about the primary purpose of Jesuit Secondary Schools in our American Culture. It is here implied that the Jesuit School's role is unique,—that its function is admittedly specialized.
2. that all procedures fall in line with the implications of the Jesuit school's specialized role:
 - a. by admitting primarily those students desirous and capable of doing college preparatory work, and
 - b. making whatever provisions are necessary adequately to meet the needs of the small minority who pursue the Jesuit curriculum as a terminal program;
3. that all statements concerning the traditional curriculum emphasize how it contributes to and facilitates the process of socialization and readiness;
4. that all statements about and implementation of the individual subjects in the curriculum demonstrate how the respective subjects foster any or all of the five types of learning which are necessary for life adjustment; moreover, attention should be given to demonstrating that the individual subjects take into account the great fact that our schools are not only Church affiliated but also society affiliated and that the teaching and training are geared to both reality factors;
5. that each of the subjects prepare an adolescent to keep apace

constructively of his developmental tasks in such a way that he is equipped to take his place in our democratic society. It is assumed that special care and attention is given to motivating the adolescent through understandings which make highly probable his undertaking a constructive role in community living.

This last point takes for granted that special planning does take place operatively to insure the plotting of activities which meet the imperative needs of all youth. It is this very process which accomplishes the goals proposed by The Life Adjustment Education program and the Commission on American Citizenship.

NOTES

¹*Life Adjustment Education For Every Youth*, Bulletin 1951, No. 22 Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Washington, D. C., p. 1.

²*ibid.*, p. 7.

³*Vitalizing Secondary Education—Education for Life Adjustment*, Bulletin 1951, No. 3, Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Washington, D. C., p. 31.

⁴*Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth*, Bulletin 18, 1948, Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Washington, D. C., p. 40.

⁵*Vitalizing Secondary Education*, p. 38 ff.

⁶*Bulletin*, N.A.S.S.P., March, 1947, pp. 1-144.

⁷*Life Adjustment Education*, Bulletin, No. 22, 1951, p. 9.

⁸*ibid.*, p. 11.

⁹*Better Men For Better Times*, Msgr. George Johnson, Catholic University Press, 1943.

Guiding Growth in Christian Social Living, Sister M. Joan and Sister Mary Nona, The Catholic University Press, 1946.

¹⁰"The Religion Class and International Understanding," *N.C.E.A. Bulletin*, August, 1947, pp. 372-376.

¹¹*Life Adjustment Education*, p. 12.

¹²*ibid.*, p. 12.

¹³*ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁴Unpublished address of Dr. Havighurst to The Life Adjustment Meeting, Washington, D. C., 1950.

¹⁵*Guiding Growth in Christian Living, etc.*, Sister M. Joan and Sister Mary Nona, The Catholic University Press, 1946.

Christian Life Adjustment Program, Sisters of Charity, Cincinnati, Ohio, Sept. 1950.

Philosophy and Objectives of the Christian Life Adjustment Program of the Archbishop Williams High School, Braintree, Mass., Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, April 1951.

¹⁶*Catholic Secondary Education: A National Survey*, Sister Mary Janet, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Department of Education, Washington, D. C., 1949.

¹⁷*Life Adjustment for Every Youth*, Bulletin 1951, No. 22, p. 11.

¹⁸*ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁹*ibid.*, p. 12.

²⁰*N.C.E.A. Bulletin*, August 1948, "Self Discipline Through Religious Motivation—The Practical Basis For Life Adjustment Education," pp. 416-425.

²¹*Life Adjustment for Every Youth*, cf. Table, p. 14.

²²*Higher Education For American Democracy*, The Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Harper and Bros., 1948, Vol. I, Establishing the Goals, p. 71.

²³*Educational Psychology*, Dr. Lee J. Cronbach, Harcourt Brace and Company, Inc., New York, 1952, p. 128.

Jesuit High School: Alumni Evaluation

JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S.J.¹

With the permission of the President of the Jesuit Educational Association and with the approval of the Executive Director, Father Rooney, a special meeting of the Secondary School Commission was held at the University of Detroit High School on December 27-28, 1951. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the various problems, which had been proposed to the Commission for study, with a view to selecting those which are more immediately necessary, determining the best procedure for their investigation, and assigning specific phases of the study to the individual members of the Commission. After due consideration of the many topics proposed, the Commission decided to undertake as its principal project for the current year an investigation of the outcomes, or results, of our secondary school education. In other words, it proposed to seek an answer to the question, "How successful is the modern Jesuit high school in preparing its students for college and for life?"

It is superfluous to point out the importance of obtaining a reasonably accurate answer to this question. To check the result of one's work is a fundamental requirement for progress and success in any field of human endeavor; without it there is only complacency, stagnation, and blind adherence to a course of action which may be totally ineffective. More than once we have heard the statement that we Jesuits are enjoying the reputation of our illustrious predecessors in the field of education. It is fitting and necessary, then, that we examine the results of our own labor. If we find that our graduates, as a whole, have a superior preparation for college and life, then we can continue our present course with the assurance that our work is in accord with the high standards of the Society; if, however, we discover that the training which our students have received is inferior, or merely average, as a preparation for college and life, then we must institute changes and perhaps some radical ones.

The study falls naturally into two parts, involving an examination of the preparation of our graduates for (1) college and (2) for life in

¹Presented at Jesuit Educational Association Annual Meeting, Secondary School Session, Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Missouri, April 14, 1952, under title of "An Alumni Evaluation of Jesuit High School Education."

general. Both tradition and needs of our present students place college preparation high in our scale of educational objectives. Historically, our high school is the successor of the lower grades of traditional Jesuit "collegium" and inherited many of the functions of these classes after the division of the original unit into high school and college. Moreover, the fact that approximately eighty-five percent of our graduates continue their studies in college obliges us to devote considerable attention to preparing them for successful work at the higher level. Hence, a separate investigation of the degree in which our graduates are equipped to do college work is indicated.

Two means of evaluating their preparation for advanced study were suggested by the Commission. The first consisted in an extensive survey of the considered opinions of experienced teachers in our own colleges who would be asked to give their candid judgment concerning degree in which our graduates are prepared to do successful work. A carefully prepared questionnaire was circulated among all our colleges and the replies were turned over to Father Roman A. Bernert who will later report to this assembly. The second means of evaluating the success of our students in college would be a more scientific study and would consist in a comparison of high school grades, or rank in class, with the rank or grades achieved by the same students in college. This project the Commission hopes to undertake during the coming year.

NECESSITY OF EVALUATION

This part of the general study proposes the question "How well the modern Jesuit high school prepares a boy for *life*, regardless of whether he goes to college or not?" The answer to this question is especially important and pertinent today since the value of our traditional academic course is seriously challenged, if not ridiculed, by the proponents of Life Adjustment Education. Their judgment concerning academic education is expressed by Sister Mary Janet, S.C. in the conclusion of her well-known booklet *Catholic Secondary Education—A National Survey* (p. 135):

This change is necessary because the traditional academic core has failed to achieve the real goals of general education. It is not suited to all students, and it possesses no integrating qualities. It is unrelated to realistic needs of wage-earners, homemakers, and citizens. It has consisted of unrelated subjects and has failed to achieve unity in educational outcomes in students either as individuals or as members of groups. It is not essentially Christian.

This charge that traditional Jesuit high school course does not meet the

real needs of students is not confined to a small, and perhaps radical group, but is the almost universal contention of Catholic and public school educators.

In the face of such a serious and universal challenge, then, it is imperative that we should take stock of our position. It is not sufficient to dismiss the matter with the assertion that our high schools are primarily college preparatory and, therefore, the entire discussion is "*praeter rem*." We still have an obligation to provide an adequate, if not superior, life preparation for the fifteen or twenty percent of our graduates who will not continue their studies after high school. Moreover, the very term "college preparatory" has come to have far less meaning that it once had; as the colleges have departed farther and farther from the liberal arts, so the studies actually required for admission to college have become fewer and fewer until the essential question is not "Are you prepared for advanced studies in language, mathematics, and science?" but rather "What marks did you receive in the courses which you selected, whether they were Greek or urban agriculture?" And finally, secondary school education, followed by college or not, constitutes a substantial part in the total training of an individual and should contribute a large share to his final preparation for life. We find a parallel in the fact that the chemistry and biology of a pre-med course are required not as a mere preparation for medical school, but rather as part of the necessary equipment of a competent physician or surgeon.

The success of a system of education cannot be measured by a scale, a yardstick, a stop-watch, or a bank account, but only by the desirable effects which it produces in the individual and the extent to which it prepares him for successful living. And who is better qualified to evaluate the degree to which this has been achieved than the individual himself who has undergone the course of training and who has had sufficient experience in life to know whether it has prepared him to meet its demands? In other words, the alumni of a school are the best judges of the value of the course of studies which they have pursued. This is the point of view taken by the automobile manufacturer who tells us that we should "ask the man who owns one." It is true, of course, that in certain cases opinions may be biased; it is equally true, however, that when a majority of people who are in possession of the facts, who are capable of a prudent judgment, and who are not influenced by self-interest concur in an opinion, that judgment must have some basis in fact and is worthy of consideration.

With this in mind the Commission determined to ask the alumni for an objective evaluation of their high school course as a preparation for

life. The ideal survey would include a canvass of all graduates of all our schools. Since, however, there was insufficient time for such a tremendous undertaking, it was decided that, for the present, a "pilot study" would be satisfactory; thus, for the present, the investigation would be limited to the alumni who graduated from four of our schools in different sections of the country in the year 1942. There were many reasons why this group was chosen. These men, who are now twenty-seven and twenty-eight years of age, are close enough to their high school days so that they have not completely forgotten their experiences and still they are far enough away from them so that they can reflect upon their education with a certain amount of mature objectivity. Being young men who are striving to succeed in business or professions and to meet their social obligations, they are acutely conscious of their educational advantages or deficiencies. Most of them, as fathers, have probably already given thought to the future training of their children. Moreover, they were members of a class which graduated during World War II and entered the Service soon after their commencement day. Hence, they found themselves in a position where they could compare their preparation for life with that of thousands of other young men from all types of schools and even from other nations.

The selection of schools which would participate in this initial study was not completely arbitrary. Since the members of the Commission were already well informed of the nature of the project and since they represented schools in widely separated sections of the country, they were asked to undertake the work involved in the survey. Hence the alumni of the following schools are represented: Loyola of Los Angeles, Jesuit High School of New Orleans, Rockhurst of Kansas City, and the University of Detroit High School. Scranton Prep also participated, but it was thought better not to incorporate the responses since the first class of that school which had been trained by Ours did not graduate until 1947.

THE ALUMNI QUESTIONNAIRE

To insure uniformity each school sent to its alumni of '42 the same questionnaire and the same explanatory letter, both of which were formulated by Father Julian Maline. The letter reads as follows:

Dear Alumnus:

It is difficult for the high school to judge confidently the worth of the particular type of education it provides, especially if that education is designed to produce *well-developed human beings* rather than primarily high-powered moneymakers. It is difficult, if not impossible, to prove statistically whether or

not a high school has succeeded in some of its important goals, often fairly intangible. Has it succeeded, for instance, in developing consistently Catholic attitudes toward the multifarious problems of life, in sharpening the student's ability to think straight and with discrimination, in fostering appreciation for the finer things of life, in instilling loyalty to one's superiors, in building habits of hard work, in training to a sense of responsibility and so on?

There are those you know, who think the courses of study in Jesuit high schools are altogether too academic, too remote from workaday life, to be of value to anyone who does not go on to college. "What is the value of Latin," they ask, "even two years of it, for those who will not continue the study of Latin in college?" And so of algebra, geometry, English literature, and the like. It is difficult to give a pat answer to some of these questions. And yet our high school would like to get some kind of answer, would like to make some sort of self-evaluation of its educational program, and looks to you, one of its mature graduates for some help. You, as an alumnus, by now probably have a fairly established opinion of your high-school education. As an alumnus will you help your Alma Mater appraise its courses of studies by giving honest answers to the following questions and by filling out the checklists? (It will help if you will sign your name and give the date of your graduation from high school; but if you prefer to remain anonymous, please send in the questionnaire anyway.) Kindly return in the enclosed envelope before March 1, 1952.

Be assured that your Alma Mater appreciates the time and trouble you spend in this act of cooperative effort.

Sincerely yours,
(Name of Principal and School)

With this letter of explanation each alumnus received a two page questionnaire in which he could record his judgment placing a check mark under the evaluation which he thought proper. At the top of the form he was asked to give his name, *if he so wished*, and to state whether he had attended college and, if so, the number of years. The questionnaire was then divided into four distinct parts. In the light of his experience in life the alumnus was asked to give:

- (1) An evaluation of his high school education as a whole;
- (2) An evaluation of each of his studies and extracurricular activities;
- (3) A judgment, based on his experience, concerning the need for greater emphasis in certain areas;
- (4) Any comments which he thought would be helpful.

Both letter and questionnaire were made as objective as possible to avoid any appearance that we were seeking a blanket endorsement or a vote of confidence. They were urged to express their frank, honest opinion and the comments in the replies indicate that this is precisely what they did. There was little reason for them to do otherwise since they no longer have any commitments in the school and, in many instances, the teachers involved are no longer members of the faculty. To make doubly sure

that they would be unhampered by personal considerations they were not required to give their names and about six percent took advantage of this honorable anonymity.

The four schools sent out a total of 378 questionnaires of which 123 or 33 percent were returned. Although the replies to all questionnaires are notoriously small in number the response to this one seems to be even lighter than usual. This cannot be attributed to a lack of interest on the part of the alumni but rather two unfortunate circumstances. In the first place, it is very difficult for a school to keep an accurate mailing list of alumni who graduated ten years previously since there is much change of residence over such a period, especially at the age when they marry and set up their own household. Then, also, the necessity of having the replies insufficient time for study and the preparation of a report compelled us to request the return of the questionnaire within two weeks—a very short time, particularly in the instances in which the mail had to be forwarded to another address.

In the replies there is ample evidence that the alumni gave the matter discriminating thought and did not merely check the questionnaire in a haphazard fashion. This seriousness is manifested in the fact that fifty percent of all the replies contained comments—some of them covering a full typewritten sheet.

The report on the replies will follow the divisions of the questionnaire which were indicated above. Thus, a summary will be given of (1) their estimate of how well their education as a whole prepared them for life; (2) their evaluation of specific experiences; and (3) their judgment concerning the need for greater emphasis in certain areas. The comments of the alumni will be introduced at the points to which they pertain.

EVALUATION OF HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION AS A WHOLE

The first question which the alumni were asked to answer was stated as follows:

Regardless of whether you went to college or not, in a general way how well do you think your years at a Jesuit high school prepared you for life?

The meaning of this question was then explained in a parenthetic statement:

(This is a broad question and covers many of the intangible outcomes that education strives to achieve. The question does not primarily refer to your success in making money, though it does not exclude success in making a living. But it covers much more: such things as the solidity of your Catholic faith and

Catholic living; your general outlook on life; your intellectual interests; your reading habits; your ability to hold your own in conversation and association with educated people; your industry; your loyalty; your ability to get on with people with whom you deal; your ability to face up to difficulties; and so on).

In the light of this explanation they were asked to indicate whether their education had prepared them for life "very well"—"moderately well"—"sufficiently well"—"poorly"—or "very poorly." One hundred and twenty-three alumni replied to this question, and made the following evaluations:

Very well—70 (56%)
Moderately well—41 (34%)
Sufficiently well—12 (10%)
Poorly—0
Very poorly—0

If we interpret the middle rating of "sufficiently well" to indicate an average training, which could be better or could be worse, then we see that 90% of the alumni considered that they had received a better-than-average, or superior, preparation for life. This general satisfaction with their education as a whole is reflected in the many tributes which they voluntarily submitted. Thus, one alumnus sets forth his own experience as a demonstration that his education was more than adequate:

My class graduated almost into the Armed Services. Though but eighteen years old, I felt older and more mature than my associates from other schools. Apparently, the Armed Forces recognized this maturity and good training in that most of my classmates as well as myself were supervisory officers, commissioned or non-commissioned.

Another alumnus is more specific and points out the elements which he found most advantageous:

The greatest benefit that I derived from Jesuit teaching was a balanced code of morals and ethics and the ability to reason logically. All of the courses, including Latin, algebra, etc., were taught with the "a" follows "b" follows "c" sort of logic that seems to govern most everything of the Jesuits teach. The heavy load of homework was not excessive—high school is an excellent time to form industrious habits, work habits that are so rare in this era of union and welfare ascendancy. The discipline maintained at Loyola was all to the good, although it is hard to really judge since most of us got more than we ever hope to see again in the armed forces.

The alumni evaluation of Jesuit education differed little from school to school, as the following comparison will demonstrate:

	Very well	Moderately well	Sufficiently well
School I	51%	42%	7%
School II	57%	36%	7%
School III	53%	34%	13%
School IV	68%	22%	10%

Combining the ratings "very well" and "moderately well" and thereby establishing a "superior" rating we find that the proportion of alumni from the various schools who considered that they had received a superior preparation was almost identical, namely, 93%, 93%, 89%, and 90%.

Nor does there seem to be any relation between their achievement in studies and their evaluation of the worth of their training. The only records which were available when this report was drawn up were those of the alumni of the University of Detroit High School. A comparison of the questionnaire ratings with the grades which the same men received in school shows the following:

	Very well	Moderately well	Sufficiently well
'A'—average student	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0
'B'—average student	12 (57%)	7 (33%)	2 (10%)
'C'—average student	7 (54%)	5 (38%)	1 (8%)
'D'—average student	3 (60%)	0	2 (40%)

The evaluation and testimonies of the alumni are very encouraging, but should not be taken as assurances of absolute perfection. Many who considered that they had been *well* prepared suggested things which they thought would have made them *better* prepared. "In answer to the question" writes a Master of Science "I checked the 'very well' answer. However, even though I do think that the preparation for life that I received in high school was indeed excellent, I do not mean to imply that there is no room for improvement."

EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTS

The second part of the questionnaire was more specific than the first and asked the alumni to estimate the value in their lives of each subject which they studied and each extracurricular activity in which they participated. Thus it said:

Again, regardless of their value in preparing for college, please check the following subjects and activities of your high school days according to their value as you now see things . . . "Value" should be interpreted as explained above.

There then followed a complete list of subjects taught in Jesuit schools

and of the customary extracurricular activities. After each subject and activity there were five check spaces in which they could indicate whether the educational experience, as a preparation for life, had been "very valuable," "of much value," "of some value," "of little value," or "of almost no value." Obviously, the first two evaluations would indicate that the experience was considered a *superior* preparation for life, the last two evaluations would declare that it was an *inferior* preparation, while the middle rating would be *noncommittal*, but certainly not an enthusiastic endorsement.

A summary of the replies to this part of the questionnaire is presented in Table I below. The following should be noted:

(1) The numbers under the evaluation scale indicate the percent of replies which ascribed each rating;

(2) Under "superior rating" is the percent of replies which judged the experience to be either "very valuable" or "of much value";

(3) The horizontal grouping of subjects indicates the value ascribed to them by the majority of the alumni; if the median rating of an experience was "of much value," that was considered to be its general evaluation by the alumni.

Highest in the alumni scale of values are religion and written and spoken English. The importance of religion in their lives is a refrain running through almost all the comments. While acknowledging all that it has done for them, they think that it would be an even more vital influence if it were made, as they say, "more practical." By this they mean that there should be more application made to the actual life-situations which all will meet, more time should be allotted to classroom discussions, and more attention should be given to the questions which are generally asked by non-Catholic associates. Thus they say:

I left high school in 1942. After a year of college, I went into the Navy's college training program. I met boys from a great variety of backgrounds and training and I found none better prepared than we were, for life and further education. But when I look at the problems we had to meet, it seems to me that we did not have adequate practical religious and spiritual training to handle them. This I say, realizing that we were better prepared than any other group I met.

Religion should be stressed more from a practical standpoint so that Catholic students can be prepared to answer the many questions put to them by their non-Catholic associates.

All have reached that point of maturity at which they realize the need of their religion to give meaning and purpose to their lives—especially when they see so many of their contemporaries tossed about like ships

TABLE I—ALUMNI EVALUATION OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION

1. Regardless of whether you went to college or not, in a general way how well do you think your years at a Jesuit high school prepared you for life? (123 replies)
Very well—56%; Moderately well—34%; Sufficiently well—10%; Poorly—0%; Very poorly—0%.

*

2. Regardless of their value in preparing you for college, please check the following subjects and activities of your high school days according to their value as you now see things.

	Superior rating		No. of Replies	Very val.	Much value	Some value	Little value	Almost no. val.
I	92%	Religion	120	73	19	8	0	0
	89%	Public speaking	73	74	15	7	1	3
	87%	English Composition	97	62	25	11	2	0
II	70%	Algebra, Elementary	124	39	31	23	3	4
	70%	Algebra, Advanced	86	43	27	20	6	4
	70%	Physics	106	41	29	24	3	3
	70%	Economics	36	42	28	19	8	3
	63%	English Literature	115	44	19	28	7	2
	63%	American History	113	27	36	30	7	0
	62%	Latin	115	33	29	34	2	2
	62%	Civics	79	30	32	33	3	2
	60%	Sociology	45	40	20	33	2	5
	60%	Trigonometry	65	29	31	29	5	6
	58%	Geometry, Plane	118	33	25	30	8	4
	56%	World History	61	29	27	36	8	0
	53%	Geometry, Solid	76	26	27	26	13	8
III	48%	Chemistry	56	28	20	34	16	2
	46%	Anc. & Med. History	101	19	27	31	19	4
	37%	Greek	51	17	20	37	10	16
	35%	Biology	17	23	12	59	6	0
	33%	French	40	5	28	42	13	12
	12%	Spanish	32	3	9	60	22	6
	98%	Assoc. with Jesuits	95	75	23	2	0	0
	94%	Daily Mass	53	73	21	6	0	0
	85%	Debating	28	57	28	4	11	0
	81%	Athletics, Intramural	93	40	41	18	1	0
	79%	Athletics, Interschol.	52	48	31	15	4	2
	78%	Mass Servers Group	18	67	11	17	5	0
	73%	Sodality	64	42	31	19	2	6
	58%	Dramatics	19	32	26	26	11	5
	55%	Publications	24	13	42	33	8	4
	46%	Glee Club-Choir	26	15	31	27	23	4
	36%	Band	14	0	36	36	7	21

3. Do you think that in your high school days more emphasis should have been put on preparing you for—

	<i>Replies</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Uncertain</i>
a. Earning a living?	116	35%	54%	11%
b. Home-making, as a husband?	113	33%	50%	12%
c. Active citizenship?	118	67%	22%	11%
d. Participation in parish activities?	120	38%	38%	24%
e. Proper use of leisure time?	117	58%	27%	15%

*

without rudders. "If any improvements were to be made," says one, "I would suggest that you might stress more the value of the Catholic Faith."

The high value which the alumni place upon public speaking is surprising until we advert to its importance in business and social life. The brilliant, well-informed mind, the retentive memory, the sound judgment—all are hidden under a bushel unless they can communicate their thoughts to others. In his analysis of what is required in a good education one alumnus places the ability to think logically as the first necessity; and, he says, "the other thing a person does all his life is 'express himself.'" In a like strain many others attest the importance of public speaking and urge that it be made a compulsory course.

English composition is another "communication art" and as such rates high with oral expression in the alumni hierarchy of educational values; ability to handle written and spoken English are competencies required in daily life. A letter, ordinary conversation, an address, a report to business or social associates, to say nothing of the daily requirements of college assignments—all demand facility in grammar and composition. "The sciences train your mind," observes an alumnus, "but you need English to put what is in your mind into words to transmit them to your fellow-man." English teachers, no doubt, will sadly reflect how often they have set the table and seasoned the food, but have not been able to induce adolescents to eat.

After these "big three" there follow thirteen subjects which they judge to be "of much value"—although in varying degrees. Mathematics (algebra, geometry, and trigonometry) and social studies (economics, sociology, civics, and history) dominate this group while literature, language (Latin) and science (physics) play a minor role. They place the value of mathematics, not so much in the practical use which they have found for it, as in its efficacy to inculcate logical thinking and to develop an analytical mind. "Mathematics," says one, "are important in teaching students to logical thinking from facts that are present. I make this statement from having taught as a graduate assistant at two different state universities

rather than from the fact that I use math all the time in my work as a chemist."

Of the social studies civics is the one which obtains most comments. For the most part, they are expressions of regret that not enough was given and that what was taught was not sufficiently practical, not up-to-date, and not presented in an interesting manner. They mirror a desire of the writers to be better prepared to understand the background and construction of the social and political world in which they live.

In comparison to the evaluation of other languages the ranking of Latin is surprisingly high. They explained this preference by stating that it compelled them to think and analyze, it gave them a better understanding of English grammar, and it provided them with a key to the meaning of many words in their own language. As one of them put it, he does not "like to see Latin sold short." The value which they derived from Latin seems to have some relation to the number of years they studied it and also to the degree in which they were successful in mastering it. A study of the records of the University of Detroit High School shows that 70% of the alumni who took Latin for four years considered it to be a superior preparation for life whereas 60% of those who took a two year course ascribed this value. The difference was even more marked between those who achieved high marks and those who merely passed; thus, 70% of the A and B students considered it to have been 'very valuable' or 'of much value,' but only 42% of the D average students concurred in this evaluation.

The lowest group of studies in the rankings are those which the majority of the alumni thought to be only "of some value." Although this is not outright condemnation, nevertheless it does seem to be "damning with faint praise." Language studies (Greek, French, and Spanish) are predominant in this group with two common sciences (Chemistry and Biology) followed close behind and with only one social science dealing with the ancient world finding a place. Those of us who have frequently heard that "a dead language such as Latin should be replaced by French or Spanish which are more useful" will find a pleasant confirmation of our own opinion in this alumni ranking. In this respect it is noteworthy that even New Orleans with its French background and its position as the 'gateway to Latin America' agrees with the evaluation of French and Spanish. The reason for this lack of preference probably lies in the fact that the languages are infrequently used in American life and are inferior to Latin as instruments for rigid mental discipline. With respect to Greek, one or two put in a good word for its value as a training in attention to detail, but others think that it should find no place in the cur-

riculum. The relatively low estimate of the two sciences, biology and chemistry, is surprising in view of the fact that we are said to be living in the 'atomic age' when a knowledge of the laws of physical nature is generally considered to be an almost indispensable preparation for so-called practical life. Could it be that the approach to these subjects is too academic and not sufficiently related to their daily lives?

EVALUATION OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Anyone who is abreast of current educational thought knows that participation in school activities is valued so highly that it is proper to refer to these as 'co-curricular' rather than 'extra-curricular.' The alumni would seem to concur in that opinion since their ratings of the value of school activities as preparations for life are generally higher than their evaluations of the various studies as a whole. It is interesting to note that the top three experiences in this group (association with the Jesuits, daily Mass, and debating) closely correspond to the three which were rated highest among the subjects studied, namely religion and self-expression.

If the boys were to proclaim their devotion to the Jesuits as strongly as the alumni, we would probably suspect their motives! It is truly encouraging and gratifying to Jesuits in the high schools to learn that, even ten years later, after a war, advanced studies, and the trials of life, their former students, almost to a man, still rate their association with them as a very valuable contribution to their lives. "The example and daily lives of the Fathers," writes one, "together with their religious teaching and close association with our Lord in the Chapel left an impression on me that, pray God, I will never forget." Among the things which another alumnus often wished he had, especially in the Service, was "more association with Jesuits after class in informal conversation, in games, or on walks; many of my saving convictions during Service, I felt, were taken on, or at least strengthened from, some value or attitude that I gleaned during such casual association." In this part of the questionnaire one alumnus made a hand-written insertion to include association with "Catholic lay teachers" as a very valuable influence in his life. This is worthy of note since we sometimes tend to overlook the contribution which these exemplary lay men make to the lives of our students.

Although they readily granted the influence which daily Mass exerted upon their lives, a few of the alumni expressed the opinion that it would be better if attendance were encouraged instead of being compelled. Many expressed the view that "debating, whether intramural or interscholastic,

is the most directly helpful single extracurricular activity." No comments were written to explain the value of intramural and interscholastic athletics, but it can be supposed that they are the same qualities which are usually extolled at football banquets.

AREAS NEEDING GREATER EMPHASIS

The proponents of the Life Adjustment Education program claim that an analysis of the life needs of modern American Catholics indicates that the proper objectives of a secondary school should be the preparation of students for family living, earning a livelihood, active citizenship, participation in parish activities, and the proper use of leisure time. It was well within the scope of our investigation, then, to ask our alumni whether their experience demonstrated that in their high school days greater emphasis should have been given to preparation for these activities. A summary of their replies is presented in Table I. It shows that a decided majority favored more training in active citizenship and in the proper use of leisure time, but that most of the graduates did not think that more emphasis need be placed on preparation for family living or for earning a living. The opinions concerning training for participation in parish activities were divided.

No other single item drew as many, or as strong, comments as did the question of preparation for earning a living. On one side were those who earnestly urged the introduction of some commercial subjects, some training in the manual trades, and some direction of the English and mathematics courses to meet common every-day needs and business requirements. Typing, for instance, would be a useful skill whether a boy went to college or not; familiarity with tools would not only give a terminal student a trade, but it would provide others with the 'know how' necessary to do ordinary repair work and would give them worthwhile hobbies. Catholic leaders, they argued, are needed in the trades as much as they are in the professions and Jesuit religious training and influence should not be denied a boy who will not go to college and who needs a trade if he is not to go out into life empty-handed. On the other hand, the cry was just as loud and insistent that we should "not change the system." In their estimation, vocational studies have small value to high school students because the types of work which are possible for even the non-professional man are so numerous that they defy any but 'on the job' training. The fundamental requirements for earning a living, this group said, were a capacity for hard work, an ability to analyze a situation and to think logically, a knack of 'getting along' with people, and a facility

in-expressing oneself in writing and in speech. This is the type of training which Jesuit high schools traditionally have given and should continue to give. So the discussion went, with the majority favoring a solid academic education over vocational training.

The desire for more emphasis on active citizenship which the alumni manifest is very understandable in view of the fact that government is becoming an increasingly larger factor in the life of every American. The war, which radically affected their lives when they were younger, and their present experience with government regulations and income tax makes government a very personal matter for them. If anything more had been needed to arouse their interest in active citizenship, they would have found it in the numerous newspaper, television, and magazine revelations of the influence which the criminal element has been able to wield in political affairs. The wish of the majority is voiced by one alumnus when he writes "I believe that the all-importance of keeping well-informed of political activities of the day, of the construction of the local and federal governments, and above all of the importance of voting at elections should be stressed more." The problem, of course, lies in arousing the interest of the adolescent in national affairs when his mind is engrossed in football and the senior prom.

The fact that a majority of the alumni feel that there is need for more training in the proper use of leisure time is a welcome assurance that television and canasta are not the soul-satisfying experiences which they were once thought to be. On the other hand, in all truth, we must admit that our concentrated training in classical languages and mathematics do not engender in many of our graduates a great yearning to be done with the work of the day so that they spend a pleasant evening with an oration of Cicero, a play of Sophocles, or an intriguing problem in solid geometry. A man must find his own hobbies, but the school can do much to determine the quality of those leisure time pursuits by the interests it awakens, the intellectual curiosity it stimulates, and the reading habits it instills. This is the work, not only of the English teachers, but of all instructors according to the opportunities presented by their subjects.

COLLEGE AND NON-COLLEGE ALUMNI

This report would not be complete without a comparison of the evaluation made by alumni who went to college and those who did not. About 14% of those who replied to the questionnaire either had no college training or so little that they could be considered equivalent to high school terminal students. This percentage closely approximates the annual pro-

portion of Jesuit high school students who do not continue their studies and hence affords us a fair study of the relative evaluations of the two groups. The comparisons of their evaluations is listed in Table II. It

TABLE II—EVALUATIONS OF COLLEGE AND TERMINAL ALUMNI COMPARED

A. In general, they were prepared:		COLLEGE	TERMINAL
1. Very well	60%	35%
2. Moderately well	32%	41%
3. Sufficiently well	8%	24%
*			
B. In particular, the studies and activities listed were considered "very valuable" or "of much value" by the percentage indicated:		COLLEGE	TERMINAL
Religion	92%	Religion 92%
Speech	89%	Speech 89%
Eng. Comp.	89%	****Civics 82%
*Adv. alg.	75%	***Amer. history 73%
Economics	73%	English comp. 73%
Elem. alg.	72%	Physics 69%
Physics	70%	Sociology 60%
**Latin	67%	Economics 57%
English lit.	66%	Elem. alg. 56%
Plane geo.	62%	World hist. 50%
***Amer. hist.	61%	English lit. 50%
Sociology	60%	*Adv. alg. 40%
Trigonometry	59%	Ancient hist. 40%
****Civics	59%	Plane geo. 37%
World hist.	57%	Solid geo. 29%
Solid geo.	56%	**Latin 23%
Chemistry	52%	French 22%
Ancient hist.	47%	Chemistry 17%
Greek	40%	Spanish 13%
Biology	38%	
French	35%	
Spanish	13%	
Assoc. w. Jesuits	99%	Assoc. w. Jesuits 89%
Daily Mass	96%	Daily Mass 88%
Intramural athlet.	82%	Sodality 80%
Sodality	72%	Intramural ath. 73%
Glee Club-Choir	43%	Glee Club-Choir 67%

(*Wide variation in rating by both groups)

C. *More emphasis* required in these areas?

	COLLEGE		TERMINAL	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Earning a living?	31%	57%	67%	33%
2. Home-making as a husband?	32%	50%	36%	50%
3. Active citizenship?	69%	22%	67%	27%
4. Participation in parish activities?	38%	41%	44%	27%
5. Proper use of leisure time?	60%	27%	53%	27%

*

should be noted that Greek, trigonometry, and biology are omitted from the second column because too few of the terminal students had taken these subjects to provide a fair percentage rating. The horizontal lines mark each drop of 25% in the ratings and the asterisks call attention to subjects concerning whose value the two groups have widely different opinions.

A study of the evaluations of these two groups reveals some interesting points. As a whole the terminal students considered that their preparation for life was less effective than did the students who continued their education in college. This same divergence of opinion is observed in the fact that, in general, the terminal students ascribed a lower value to the various courses of study than the college students. This is particularly true of Latin and advanced algebra, which the majority of terminal students did not consider to have superior value as preparations for life. On the other hand, their esteem for the value of civics and American history was much higher than that of the college students. There is a remarkable unanimity in their high evaluation of religion, public speaking, and English composition. The table of ratings by the terminal students relegates language studies and advanced mathematics to the lower section, below the 50% mark, but shows a heavy concentration of social studies in the upper brackets. The latter studies, of course, are more concerned with the acquisition of *information* while the former have as their objective an intellectual *formation*. Nowhere, however, is the difference between the two groups as manifest as it is in their judgment concerning the necessity of greater emphasis on earning a living. Two-thirds of the terminal students think that more should be done in this respect, but approximately an equal proportion of the college students maintain that we continue to insist on a straight academic course.

The question, which was proposed at the beginning of this study, was "How successful is the modern Jesuit high school in preparing its students for life?" This survey was not intended to be an exhaustive, or necessarily

conclusive, treatment of the question, but rather a trial balloon sent up to test the drift of alumni thought concerning the value of their education in view of their subsequent life. We are now in a position to give their judgment in a summary form:

(1) In the opinion of a vast majority of these young men, their Jesuit high school education was at least a better than average, or superior, preparation for life.

(2) The elements in their education which they valued most highly were those which met their *fundamental* needs as human beings, namely:

(a) an understanding and appreciation of their *Faith*, derived from instruction, example, and daily contact with the sources of grace;

(b) a habit of orderly, logical *thinking*, induced by mathematics, Latin, and Jesuit classroom procedure;

(c) a competency in oral and written *expression*, obtained from public speaking, debating, and English composition;

(d) an understanding of the *society* in which they live, provided by civics, history, economics, and sociology;

(e) an ability to '*get along*' with *people*, fostered by participation in extracurricular activities in general.

(3) The fact that only a little more than half of the alumni who replied considered that they were 'very well' prepared indicates that a large proportion believes that there is room for improvement. The nature of the improvement is revealed by the table of evaluations and by their comments. At the top of their ratings are religion, public speaking, and English composition—things which they *use* in their daily life; at the bottom of the list are Greek, biology, French, and Spanish—studies, which they will tell you, they have never *used*. This same refrain runs through their comments: "make the instruction in religion more practical," "give more practice in public speaking," "make them write letters in English classes," "see that they have a practical knowledge of their government and their civic responsibilities," etc. They seem to be saying, "By all means, teach us to think logically and to express ourselves well because these are the essential things; but, if in conjunction with these, you can also point our studies at the specific needs of our daily life, then you have achieved the ideal."

In conclusion, then, it can safely be said that, in the opinion of the alumni, there is no necessity to abandon, or radically revise, our traditional course of studies. At most, they suggest that we should put greater emphasis on the mastery of those phases which they will be called upon to use most frequently in their future lives. We can sharpen the instrument

of training, but certainly should not throw it away. This is definitely the opinion of the alumnus who writes:

In college at the University of Kansas and at Harvard Graduate School of Business I ran up against many products of the educational philosophy which educates for "making a living, plus genteel relaxation, plus duty as a citizen." Their training, by comparison, was greatly inadequate. . . .

Please don't follow the crowd overboard by replacing Greek and Latin with "Woodworking," "Preparation for Marriage," and "Responsibilities of Citizenship!" Keep making the boys *think*! Don't just start lecturing at them! You have been doing a swell job which I would not like to see changed before you get a chance at my kids!

If all the alumni who state that their sons must have a Jesuit education, actually carry out this determination, there should be no concern about our future enrollments.

College Deans Evaluate Jesuit High Schools

ROMAN A. BERNERT, S.J.¹

Before getting into the meat of the study on the evaluation of Jesuit High School Education by Jesuit Colleges, I think it proper to say a few words about the circumstances of a report such as this—circumstances, at least, as I envision them to be.

The atmosphere in which a dean, like any principal, fills out the type of questionnaire that forms the basis for this study calls for some comment, because I think the atmosphere must be considered in not a few cases. A dean, like a principal again, opens the morning mail in something of a rush; if it is a normal day (it may still be as early as 9:00 or 9:30), he is probably already behind schedule. As he opened his mail on January 22 or 23, 1952, he saw the questionnaire that had been sent out by Father Edward Rooney; and then very probably he did one of two things, either of which has become a habit with him under similar circumstances: either he answered the questionnaire almost immediately or he placed it on his desk for future reference. If he did the latter, there is high probability that said questionnaire is still on the desk. If he answered it at once, he himself would be the last to say that his replies could not profit by more reflection and discussion. I do not mean to imply that his answers are incorrect; I am merely trying to make you aware of the circumstances in which many of us operate. And I think the impossibility of giving a questionnaire like this more time, thought, and evaluation explains in many instances the widely divergent replies that were sent in.

The questionnaire, dated January 21, 1952, was sent to the rectors of the colleges and universities in the Assistancy with the request that it be returned by February 15. The fact that twenty-one (21) colleges and universities responded is proof of the interest and cooperation of the many deans in question.

As to the results of the questionnaire itself, I should say that many answers overlap, many are open to interpretation, and I know beforehand that not a few of the slants I may give them would be slanted in quite a different direction by those who sent in the replies in the first place.

¹"Evaluation of Jesuit High School Education by Jesuit Colleges" was delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, high school session, Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Missouri, April 14, 1952.

But we'll put it out as we see it, and then make adjustments later if that is necessary.

Before proceeding, I should explain the identification system being used. Since many of the replies are of a semi-confidential type, Father William Mehok of the Jesuit Educational Association Central Office suggested that each college be given a code letter while each high school be given a code number. The colleges and universities, therefore, run from *A* to *Za*, while the high schools cover the numbers from 1 to 38 inclusive. In many instances the college draws students from several high schools. Hence, a code identification, for example, of *L 13, 15* means that college *L* is reporting on the students it gets from high schools 13 and 15. Some of the studies showing the academic weaknesses or strengths of different high school graduates were likewise worked out by Father Mehok before he sent the material on to me, and I wish to acknowledge his assistance.

The questionnaire contained eight different questions aimed at various areas in which high school graduates display obvious strength or weakness in their freshman year in college.

Question 1: *Has your institution made any scientific inquiries into the success of your college freshmen?* (This means freshmen in general, not just those from Jesuit high schools.)

Answers: Ten (10) colleges reported that they had made such a study; nine (9) said they had not; two (2) did not answer the question.

Question 2: *Have these studies given evidence that Jesuit high school graduates have any particular advantage or disadvantage in their success in freshman year of college?*

Answers: Ten (10) colleges said their studies showed such evidence. Eight (8) indicated that Jesuit high school graduates display an advantage; two (2) said their studies indicated that Jesuit high school graduates showed a disadvantage; while eleven (11) did not answer the question at all.

Question 3: *If yes, are Jesuit high school graduates when compared with graduates of other high schools: a) better prepared for college? b) equally well prepared for college? c) less well prepared for college?*

Answers: Eight (8) report that their Jesuit high school graduates are better prepared for college; two (2) say they are less well prepared; two (2) others said they have no evidence either way; nine (9) did not answer.

The following five questions are of the fill-in type, and, as would be expected, display a much wider and more interesting range of answers.

Question 4: *In what areas, if any, are Jesuit high school graduates superior to graduates of other high schools?*

Answers: Twelve (12) colleges volunteered a reply to this. Languages were mentioned six times explicitly. English merited comment five times. A few quotes on these two topics plus a few other diversified ones will bring out the advantage of Jesuit high school graduates over others in their subsequent college work:

B-38 says: "In placements tests, High School 38 had seven (7) out of the top ten (10)."

C-All says: "Ability to reason, to grasp principles and apply them."

H-11, 14: "English. They definitely express themselves better, both orally and in writing."

N-19: "In general, they have less problems of adjustment and seem to fall into line quite easily and well. They speak and write better English. They seem to have acquired orderly habits of study and of attacking problems."

P-23: "Knowing how to study . . . Expecting outside study . . . Consciousness of grammar . . . Strength in verbal factor . . . Generally better mathematical sequence of courses . . . English achievement is higher . . . More logical in approach to a problem."

U-27: "We have conclusive evidence of superiority in English, mathematics, classical and modern foreign languages, and science."

Question 5: *In what areas could the Jesuit high school curriculum or emphasis be improved?*

Answers: Twelve (12) colleges answered this question. Mathematics was mentioned explicitly seven (7) times, while social studies received three (3) explicit mentions. My general impression, however, from reading through the questionnaires several times is that many college instructors and administrators feel that our graduates are definitely weak in knowledge and interest in social problems, current events, citizenship and allied areas. A few quotes to show what I mean:

E-5, 6, 7, 8, 9: "Social studies, modern languages, oral English, sight translation, history, general science."

P-23: "Decidedly in the area of modern history, political science, modern problems."

T-25: "Jesuit graduates are extremely weak in knowledge of social problems and current affairs. Natural sciences and mathematics are too much de-emphasized."

W-30: "Development of better study habits. More insistence on and better teaching in Latin and mathematics."

Question 6: *Apart from scientific studies and basing your judgment on intelligent observation of Jesuit and other high school graduates and supposing equal intelligence and scholastic aptitude as measured by tests,*

would you say that Jesuit high school graduates are better prepared for college?

Answers: Twenty-one (21)—that is, all of the colleges that answered the questionnaire—likewise answered this question. Seventeen (17) reported in their affirmative; that is, Jesuit high school graduates in general are better prepared for college than graduates of other high schools. Three (3) replied in the negative; one (1) said it did not have sufficient evidence to make judgment in the matter. There is little purpose in reporting all the evidence brought forth to support the affirmative answers. Ten (10) schools sent in rather elaborate reports on the academic performance of Jesuit high school graduates. A few statistics may be interesting:

B-38: In the placement tests given in September, 1951: In religion, School 38 had seven (7) out of the top ten (10). In English, it had only three (3) out of the top ten (10), and they ranked fifth, ninth and tenth. Freshmen on the Dean's List at the end of the first semester: 1951-1952, School 38 had three (3) out of six (6) (fifty percent) whereas only forty-six percent of the entire Freshman class were Jesuit high school graduates. 1950-1951, only one student made the Dean's List and he was a Jesuit high school graduate. 1949-1950, School 38 had eight (8) out of fifteen (15) on the Dean's List (fifty-three and three tenths percent), while only thirty-four and six tenths percent of the entire class were graduates of the local Jesuit high school.

E-5, 6, 9: A study was made of college averages in sophomore, junior, and senior years of students from four Jesuit and four non-Jesuit high schools. The Jesuit schools ranked first, fourth, fifth and sixth among these eight groups.

G-5, 6, 9: "We have a large Jesuit freshman population. Two hundred seventeen (217) took the semester examinations in January, and the breakdown on them was as follows: One hundred six (106) were graduates of Jesuit high schools and one hundred eleven (111) of non-Jesuit schools. Among the one hundred six Jesuit boys, there were thirty-eight (38) conditions and ten (10) failures in individual subjects. Among the one hundred eleven (111) non-Jesuit graduates, there were fifty-eight (58) conditions and twenty-seven (27) failures. Eleven (11) non-Jesuit graduates were dropped for academic difficulties, whereas only four (4) Jesuit graduates were dropped for that same reason."

P-23: A list of all students was classified under their high schools with entrance test scores and honor point averages at end of the first semester. An analysis of the local Jesuit high school and three (3) of the largest local public schools showed the following: The Jesuit high school ranked

first in ability by a wide margin. (The difference, for instance, in Gross Psychological Score of sixty-four and seven tenths percent—64.7%—and forty-eight and eight tenths 48.8%). In Honor Point Average at the end of the first semester, the Jesuit school ranked a bare second, only one-one hundredth of a point ahead of the third ranking school.

W-30: (This is our last example). University W administered three tests, among others, to incoming freshmen: an I. Q. test, The California Progressive Achievement Test of Language Usage, and the Iowa Silent Reading Test. The archdiocesan schools, not counting school 30, placed thirty-seven percent (37%) of their graduates in the first quartile in the Iowa Silent Reading, and thirty-two percent (32%) in the Progressive Achievement Language Test; whereas the local Jesuit high school placed sixty percent (60%) of its graduates in the first quartile of the Iowa Silent, and thirty-seven percent (37%) in the Progressive Achievement.

Lest we feel too elated about these figures, we can mention a report from one school (Z-34) which reads: "Indication from comparison of grade point average in high school and college seems to be that many students coming from Jesuit high schools are not as well prepared to begin their college work as those coming from public high schools."

Question 7: *On the premises of number 6, what are the outstanding shortcomings of Jesuit high school graduates upon their entry to your freshman classes?*

Answers: Twenty (20) of the twenty-one (21) schools answered this question. The views expressed differ widely, but let me quote several and then have you determine for yourselves what is the more prevalent shortcoming.

A-37, 38: "Many choose the courses in chemistry and physics with poor preparation in mathematics. This stems from lack of guidance in high school. Often times they are directed according to preference and not aptitudes. All too often they have been advised to take Greek in preference to mathematics. Another fault I have discovered in interviewing them personally is that they do not read or study any more than is absolutely necessary in preparation for examinations. They are not informed on current events, and many of them have poor study habits."

B-38: "The graduates of our schools have not been taught to work. This is true of other high school graduates as well, but the impression with regard to ours is heightened by this: Graduates of our schools are inclined to be querulous, to buckle under pressure, to rely on the teacher's giving way to his demands out of mercy to the student."

E-6, 7, 8, 9: "History, interest in science as science; poise; unaware of contemporary problems; too sheltered; spoon-fed. . . . All the deans

placed particular stress upon the weakness in Jesuit high school graduates in oral expression in English; (they likewise) mentioned the weakness in social studies and history. . . . Majority have not been brought out sufficiently; they have not been taught to work on their own and develop initiative. . . . From one point of view it helps the boys to integrate themselves in the system rather well, but in many cases they almost feel too much at home, and so take too much for granted. . . . We polish off very well the superior students, but the general run does not seem to get sufficient training and attention. . . . Turn-over in teaching scholastics and their relative inexperience. Not sufficient cooperation between the Jesuit and lay teachers in many high schools where in many cases the laymen are the more experienced teachers. . . ."

G-5, 6, 9: "Generally helped too much and find it difficult to stand on their own, if at all weak. . . . They are not as independent as graduates of non-Jesuit high schools by-and-large, and seem to expect a great deal of help in everything."

H-11, 14: "Perhaps too dependent upon their teachers."

P-23: "Too many able high school students are permitted to substitute Spanish or some other modern language in junior year just because they so wish. We do not miss the Greek (which only a few Jesuit high school students elect locally), but do think that the able students should be given four years of Latin."

S-21: "Not enough mathematics is taught to the average student. Two sciences are taught. These must be repeated in college, but the mathematics would not."

T-25: "Ignorance of social problems. . . . Some are inclined to be 'wise' and think they know all the answers. They are, nevertheless, our best students and best leaders."

Z-31: "The boy from . . . (School 31) is not matured. Apparently too much has been done for him at high school and too much was dependent upon the work done in the classroom. As soon as a boy receives a limited number of lecture hours at the university, and the responsibility falls upon him for library work, outside assignments, etc., the Jesuit high school boy seems not to have been properly trained for this approach. Factors involved here are many; i.e., a certain attitude of 'I have all the answers', and perhaps from too close association with the Jesuits, a slight case of anti-clericalism as opposed to their attitude toward secular instructors. In a great many cases, by the end of their four years of college they rank very high academically. The potential is there all the time, but apparently habits of industry and of responsibility seem to have been under-developed at the time of matriculation. . . . The courses are there,

but the personnel is weak. I am afraid that the immaturity of the scholastics reflects itself in their pupils."

Za-34: "It would seem that many graduates of Jesuit high schools fail properly to appreciate what it means to go to college. . . . Either the curriculum in the high school needs readjusting, or the quality of teaching needs improvement, or probably a little bit of both. In any event, I do not think that products of Jesuit high schools are as well prepared to go to college as is commonly thought. . . . From the survey we made of fifteen (15) high schools in the state, we find that no Jesuit high school graduate did as well in college as he did in high school. As a matter of fact, the three Jesuit high schools are [ranked] twelve (12), thirteen (13), and fourteen (14) respectively out of the group of fifteen (15)."

Question 8: *Other comments, if any?*

A-37, 38: "Need of proper preparation for objective examinations. . . . I am afraid that if your study is based only on Jesuit high school students attending Jesuit colleges, the results will not be satisfactory. The best students from Jesuit high schools do not necessarily attend Jesuit colleges."

G-5, 6, 9: "I have discussed impressions with some of the freshmen teachers and this is rather the unanimous agreement. In native intelligence the over-all picture is somewhat better among Jesuit high school students. For our type of training, they are naturally better prepared and fit into the picture of freshman year more smoothly."

K-13: "Jesuit high school students are leaders in school activities and show greater maturity of judgment."

V-All: "Jesuit graduates write correctly, speak well; lack initiative. originality."

Za-33, 35, 36: "From my personal experience in teaching philosophy, Jesuit high school pupils are better prepared than the others."

This concludes the report proper. By way of summary, I would say that three points call attention to themselves by reason of their frequent mention and the peculiar emphasis given them almost every time they are mentioned:

1. Graduates of Jesuit high schools are, in general, somewhat better equipped for collegiate work than graduates of other high schools.

2. The two areas that show the most notable weaknesses are mathematics and the social sciences.

3. There is enough solid interest in the subject to warrant a complete statistical study of the entire subject of Jesuit high school graduates' performance in Jesuit colleges and universities.

Religious Perspectives of College Teaching

BERNARD WUELLNER, S.J.

The Edward W. Hazen Foundation of New Haven has spent about ten years in steady interest and publication in the field of the relations of religion and higher education. Some eminent scholars have been participating in its work. Its books and pamphlets have attracted attention in state and urban universities as well as in church-related institutions. The present series of pamphlets brings the thinking of these scholars directly to the classroom level, for the series is devoted mainly to the influence and place of religion in the collegiate instruction in particular fields. The fields so far treated in the series are English literature, history, economics, philosophy, classics, the preparation of teachers, music, the physical sciences, experimental psychology, anthropology, political science, and biology. Three more pamphlets on other fields are promised, though inquiry about their subjects and authors and dates of publication left us without information. Single copies are available gratis to teachers and graduate students; additional copies can be obtained for twenty-five cents each. The whole set seems destined for later publication in one volume under Professor Hoxie N. Fairchild's editorship.

The writers have been thinking of their classes and of their colleagues in secular and in some non-Catholic church-related institutions. But many of their ideas will be useful to the Catholic college teacher. While the writers run through a broad spectrum of religious views from Catholic and strong Anglo-Catholic to the loosest forms of liberal Protestantism, yet all agree on an objective idea of the Supreme Being, on the expression of religion in creed, cult, and code, and on the importance of religion in education and in life.

It may be good to make a few general remarks on the whole series and then some particular remarks about single numbers in the set.

A Catholic sympathetic to the religious pluralism in the secular institution and the problems that this creates for a teacher with a religious outlook must recognize great merits and some great weaknesses in the series. We would judge that the papers on English literature, economics, music, the physical sciences, anthropology, and political science and biology are a great success and very instructive. The ones on history and classics are mild successes. The ones on philosophy, experimental psy-

chology, and especially the one on the preparation of teachers are serious failures and quite unworthy of the other members of the company. The more rationalist and more liberally Protestant the writers' viewpoints, the less they have to say and the more confusing is their comment and the less connected with the whole subject is their contribution. But even the three notable failures have something to tell us about the academic and religious thinking of this type of professor.

While each writer ought to have given his principal attention to the links between religion and his particular teaching field, nearly all felt that in their secular collegiate environment they had to justify to their colleagues an interest in and a use of religious ideas in their teaching. Hence, we have many careful statements about the academic freedom of teachers, about the dangers and safeguards against authoritarian indoctrination, about the freedom of students to learn something about religion in schools, and about tolerance of the indifferent and anti-religious attitudes of other teachers. The resultant impression is that it takes more than a little courage to think, believe, and teach religious relations in secular schools. These religious-minded teachers seem to be on the defensive and in need of protecting their views against bigotry in the profession. It all makes a Catholic teacher wonder what chances an immature Catholic student can have in these colleges if aloofness and hostility to religion are the rule.

The first pamphlet to appear was that on English literature by Professor Hoxie N. Fairchild of Hunter College. He is the admired author of the notable three volumes on *Religious Trends in English Poetry*. In twenty-two pages he has written clearly and ably of the place of a religious outlook in the personal and in the academic life of the teacher of literature. He defends the immediate pertinence of a religious philosophy in this teaching and shows the wealth of religious ideas which a teacher must call to the attention of students in order to secure any understanding of the content of literature. His essay is also full of concrete illustrations for lectures, quiz periods, readings, and so forth. All this the teacher can and ought to do, and yet always be teaching English and never becoming a preacher. One is tempted to quote his views and suggestions without ceasing, and any one would like to invite him to lecture to forums of Catholic teachers of languages.

Professor Kenneth E. Boulding of the University of Michigan writes on *Religious Perspectives in Economics*. After noticing that religion is a matter for the whole man, and economics, as a specialty, considers only partial human interests and is therefore potentially inimical to religion, he describes various interrelations of religion and economics. He admits

that the literature of economics has given slight attention to religion and especially little to the content of religion. There should be no conflict between religion and economics if the believer uses scientifically valid economic theory for his own ends. There is much contact between religion and economics in these areas: the description of economic institutions and the moral virtues needed in the pursuit of economic life, in the study and determinations of economic policy and ends which must be human and so religious, and in the field of intellectual integration of the social sciences around religion. In this last point about integration, he discusses the opinion of one of his Catholic colleagues that the state university today is a city of God that is all suburbs, without a center and without arterial connections of the subjects in the suburbs. Professor Boulding knows that religion must remain the center of the city of God as well as of the university.

E. Harris Harbison of Princeton University writes on history, and largely on the philosophy or meaning of Christian history. He is much concerned with professional prejudice against a man who is both a Christian and an historian, and anxious to remain both a competent historian and a genuine Christian. How fuse the two loyalties? How express them both in one's actual classroom practice? This paper is the strongest of all in the set in its remarks that students want to know where the teacher stands, that students are not content with too neutral, sceptical, or non-committal instruction. It is quite clear to Professor Harbison that a teacher's beliefs must make an enormous difference in his interpretations and in his sympathies in teaching the best attested facts of history. No reader could reflect on his remarks and ever again feel that it is a matter of little consequence in a Catholic college whether or not the teacher himself thinks as a Catholic. Unfortunately, after scoring many good points, this paper has a very weak, compromising ending in which a broadly liberal Protestant viewpoint annuls many of the earlier observations and suggestions. Hence, this paper must be read with great discrimination and with expectation that the reader will be left bewildered about the exact ground on which its writer stands.

Yale's Professor Theodore M. Greene writes the fairly long paper on the teaching of philosophy. The central problem is the very old one of the conflicts and co-operation of the distinct but related fields of philosophy and theology. On the role of the teacher of philosophy he suggests nothing that is not age-old practice in the teaching of scholastic philosophy. On this teaching aspect, the paper is very jejune. But there is a cause of considerable intellectual excitement in Professor Greene's anxiety that a true philosopher must be so rationalist that he cannot

remain philosopher and accept supernatural religious knowledge. This, too, is a now ancient position. But the excitement comes from the sincerity and good will with which so fine a man interested in religion so forcibly conveys the difficulty. Those who read his comment in *Time* (Oct. 29, 1951) on the Buckley book about Yale were reading only an echo of his outcry against dogmatism. It would be valuable for some competent scholastic philosopher to take the theme of this series and work out its implications not in Greene's mode but with the attitudes taken by Professors Fairchild, Taylor, Hallowell, and President McCrady.

Alfred R. Bellinger, Latin professor at Yale, writes a short pamphlet on the classics. It is a good brief statement of the nature of the gods in Greek literature and to a less extent in Latin literature. About three pages before the end of the essay, he opens a discussion of the religious relevance of the classics to the Christian era. The fundamental unimportance of pagan religion to the Christian is noted; but the moral side of pagan religion is given scant attention, and little reference is made to the whole business of the Christian appropriation of pagan thought. An admirer of the religious content of modern literatures could use this essay as a proof of the comparative unimportance of the literary classics to modern undergraduate education. There is too little light in the old lamps of the pagan classics.

The Preparation of Teachers by Robert Ulich of Harvard has been called dangerous by some educators. It is the big mistake of the series, but perhaps is not perilous because it is too empty of content, too vague in its philosophy and in its recommendations, too bigoted in its dogmatizing against all religious dogma, too uninspiring with its proposal that a teacher's religious motivation is some consecration to undefined democracy.

Music is the contribution of Professor Joseph S. Daltry of Wesleyan University. Perhaps his connection with a church-related institution frees this writer from the doctrinaire worries about the place of religion in his subject. He knows that it has a place. Excellent judgment characterizes this whole essay. Those responsible for college choirs and organists and those interested in counseling students with musical abilities will find here brief and helpful suggestions. The thoughts of the paper make one begin to wonder whether we are not in our own universities neglecting this avenue of religious help to our students.

Hugh S. Taylor, chemist and dean of the Graduate School of Princeton, gives us a sound piece on Religious Perspectives of College Teaching in the Physical Sciences. He is devoted to Christianity, to liberal education, and to his own specialty. After wittingly summing up the absurd

apotheosis of science in the question: "What has Science to say with respect to the doctrine of the Incarnation?" he states: "It is the purpose of this essay to deny that science can ever assume the central position in human affairs to which present tendencies appear to urge it. It will suggest that these tendencies arise from a mistaken view with respect to the nature of science and ignore its limitations. It will set forth, briefly, the essential nature of science. It will trace, in barest outline, how science developed from its earliest origins to the position of intellectual hegemony into which it may be elevated. It will record how religion and science have areas which they share in common and how also they each possess areas distinct and characteristic. The particular focus of the effort is the student, in college or university, who, dimly conscious of the resource and power of each approach to the problems of life as he apprehends them, would welcome the point of view of one who essays to combine both scientific effort and religious practice in harmonious relation to each other."

This ambitious outline could not be fully handled in the 33 pages which he allows himself. Any Christian teacher of the sciences would do well to make his own all of Professor Taylor's general suggestions and his class-room hints. The danger is not science, but too exclusive specialization in science, and with this specialization goes the loss of the sense of full reality and the awareness of the primacy of the spiritual order. "Somehow or other the teacher of science must communicate in his teaching, in his work, in his life, the truth that our physical universe can go down into physical death unless we can at the same time make of it a sacramental universe." Professor Taylor also judges that the fact content and thought content of modern physical science is no intellectual danger or enemy to Christianity.

Experimental Psychology, in the strictly limited sense of the word "experimental," is treated by Professor Robert B. MacLeod of Cornell in a way which neither a religious thinker nor any liberally educated man will find satisfactory. Perhaps the writer is too fearful of professional reprisals against himself, perhaps too narrow in his view of the place of religion in human life. His first problem is: Can a man be both religious and a psychologist? His answer seems to be: Yes, if you treat religion like a scientific psychologist. But this would seem to be the wrong way of answering. Most of the paper is concerned with a plea for wider and better interest in religious phenomena as a legitimate field of scientific study in psychology. One may sum up by saying that an atheist could have written this paper and remained a very solid atheist and contributed almost nothing to the purpose or content of the whole "Religious Perspectives" series.

Anthropology, cultural of course, is capably discussed by Professor Dorothy D. Lee of Vassar. She contends that religion is of the very fabric of culture, and must be presented as a unifying not an isolated element of daily life. She gives many interesting examples where religious ideas influence a vast variety of other human activities, even on the material plane. She advises against courses in primitive religion, for these would separate religion from its cultural totality. Instead, "the teaching of religion must form a part of all courses dealing with culture."

The eleventh paper is Professor John H. Hallowell's on Political Science. This distinguished teacher at Duke University has expressed his personal fealty to the Greek-scholastic tradition in his *Main Currents in Modern Political Thought* (p. 653). The present paper is a miniature masterpiece: clear, sane, freshly thought, unequivocal, and courteous. He notes that since political science is concerned with human behavior and seeks practical knowledge of the best means of promoting justice among men, the political scientist must know man in his real nature. History bases his conviction that present-day crises come largely from political philosophies and systems which do not know man and which minimize man's capacities to do evil and man's need of control against evil. His mind here shows its slight freckling by neo-orthodox Protestant pessimism. Now, Hallowell observes, Christianity is an historical fact; but though it is not a political philosophy nor system, it provides perspectives and principles for the better accomplishment of political tasks because it gives us a realistic understanding of man, his motives, his potentialities, his needs, his dignity, his community nature, and the political necessities for human freedom, justice, control of evil desires, and charity. In the concrete accomplishment of political aims, Christianity alone can supply the charity that motivates justice and that prevents force from failing. Furthermore, the teacher of political science is entirely within his rights in teaching the bearings of Christianity on his subject, on the meaning of the literature of political thinkers, and on the success of political institutions; for religion is objective truth; religion affects all subjects; the place and influence of religion is relevant as a form of objective learning presented with reasoned considerations and historical reality. Just as any teacher may use philosophy in any other branch, so he may use religion wherever it is relevant to objective learning.

The last paper so far published treats Biology in 22 pages by President Edward McCrady of the University of the South. It, too, is a jewel in this set of essays, and an interesting counterpart to Dean Taylor's contribution on the physical sciences. After deprecating irrelevant and insincere moralizing from biological facts, he starts a vigorous exposition

of the essential links between the teaching of biology and the truths of religion. Of many lucid points scored, the three most impressive ones are: first, the compatibility of evolution of living things with the Christian theory of creation, even of the Genesis theory of creation; second, a summary on page 16 of the concurring evidences from the sciences that the universe had a beginning in time, that is, that it was created in about half an hour after a flash of light some 3 to 5 billion years ago; and third, the analogy between the evolution of living colonies and the mystical body of Christ. Perhaps the teacher of the arguments from design and creation will find no better careful statement of a scientist on many up-to-the-moment facets of the rebuttal to atheistic, mechanistic science than in this little pamphlet. (Fortunately, the writer promises us a full-length book on the same object; and it will be a beauty, we think.) Lastly, the closing two or three pages of the paper are full of measured wisdom. The author recognizes that religion does not need science for its foundation. Secondly, he calls to our attention that omission of religious teaching and of the enormous religious implications of other truths is itself a teaching of religion, a "counter-indoctrination which actually pervades most teaching at the college level." The passage that follows sweeps through many parts of a curriculum to prove the point, and ends with the sciences. In conclusion he presents this challenge: "If religion really is genuinely related to nearly every course in the curriculum, let us bring this fact right out into the open and discuss it whenever it is appropriate. It will not be wholly bad to have religion thus woven into the entire fabric of education instead of isolated in little fragments delivered to a relatively small clientele."

The whole series may well have the effect of making the university world in America pick up heart. The vigorous wisdom of a group of writers has lit the funeral fires beneath the waste of a theory of academic freedom that applied only to the anti-religious and secularist. To the Catholic university world, the series suggests that a similar project conceived in vision and adequately financed might promote scholarship and Catholicism in all fields of learning in our own schools.

News from the Field

CENTRAL OFFICE

INSTITUTE for Jesuit Principals was held at Regis College, Denver, August 4-15, 1952. It was directed by Father Lorenzo K. Reed with the assistance of Father Eugene F. Gallagher. Seventy-one Jesuits attended.

RELIGION INSTITUTE: "Proceedings of the National Jesuit Institute on College Religion—August 2-14, 1951," edited by Father Eugene B. Gallagher with the assistance of Fathers Eugene H. Buchan and Andrew H. McFadden have appeared in a 381 page off-set book. As of the Central Office at a cost still undetermined, which will cover printing and publication of this issue, copies will be available for distribution from the mailing.

NEW SCHOOLS: Announcements of new schools during the past few months came so fast that it has been impossible to get specific details. The Oregon Province plans to open a high school in Missoula, Montana; the Maryland Province plans to open a college in Wheeling, West Virginia and the New York Province is opening a high school in Rochester, N. Y.

"MANUAL for Jesuit High School Administrators" prepared by a Committee of the J.E.A. under the chairmanship of Father Lorenzo K. Reed is now ready for distribution by this office. Including reprints, digests and bibliographic references to the best in Jesuit secondary educational theory and practice, the volume formed the basis for the recent Denver Principals Institute. Cost is \$3.25.

DIRECTORY CHANGES: Page 4: Rev. John V. McEvoy, S.J., Socius, N. Y. Province. Page 8-9: *Creighton University*, College of Arts and Sciences, Rev. Laurence F. Jansen, S.J., Assistant Dean; School of Medicine, Rev. John J. Foley, S.J., Regent. Page 10: *Fordham University*, Rev. William J. Mulcahy, S.J., Vice-President for Business and Finance instead of Executive Assistant to President; Rev. Edwin A. Quain, S.J., Academic Vice-President; College of Arts and Sciences, Rev. Thomas J. McGurty, S.J., Dean of Men replacing Rev. Harvey J. Haberstroh, S.J., Dean of Discipline; School of Education, Rev. Philip H. O'Neill, S.J., Assistant Dean; Graduate School, Rev. Joseph G. Keegan, S.J., Assistant Dean; City Hall Division, Rev. Laurence S. Atherton, S.J., Director; School of Pharmacy, Rev. Charles T. Taylor, S.J., Regent. Page 11: *Georgetown University*, College of Arts and Sciences, Rev. E. Paul Betowski, S.J., Assistant Director of Student Personnel; School of Medicine,

Rev. Thomas J. O'Donnell, S.J., Assistant Dean. Page 13: *Loyola College*, Evening School etc., William M. Davish, S.J., Dean. Page 13: *Loyola University* (Chicago), Rev. Jeremiah J. O'Callaghan, S.J., Academic Vice-President. Page 14: *Loyola University* (Los Angeles), College of Arts and Sciences, Rev. David J. Walsh, S.J., Dean of Men. Page 15: *Loyola University* (New Orleans), College of Arts and Sciences, delete "Rev. George T. Bergen, S.J." Page 16: *Marquette University*, College of Arts and Sciences, Rev. Raymond R. McAuley, S.J., Dean of Men. Page 17: *St. Joseph's College*, Evening College Division, Rev. Francis McG. A. Nugent, S.J., Dean. Page 18: *St. Louis University*, School of Commerce and Finance, delete "Thomas E. Quinn." Page 19: *Spring Hill College*, Rev. Andrew C. Smith, S.J., President; College of Arts and Sciences, Rev. George T. Bergen, S.J., Dean. Page 22: *Xavier University*, College of Arts and Sciences, Rev. John J. Wenzel, S.J., Dean of Men. Page 23: *Brooklyn Preparatory School*, Rev. J. Vincent Watson, S.J., Headmaster. Page 23: *Canisius High School*, Rev. John G. Sturm, S.J., Prefect of Discipline. Page 24: *Creighton University High School*, Rev. Charles T. Shinnars, S.J., Assistant Principal. Page 24: *Fordham Preparatory School*, Rev. William J. Farricker, S.J., Principal. Page 24: *Gonzaga* (D.C.) *High School*, Rev. William F. Troy, S.J., Principal. Page 25: *Loyola* (Md.) *High School*, Rev. Louis C. Kleff, S.J., Prefect of Discipline. Page 25: *Loyola School*, *Regis High School* (N.Y.), Rev. Robert I. Gannon, S.J., Rector. Page 26: *St. Peter's College High School*, Telephone Henderson 4-4400. Page 28: *Alma College*, change to "Los Gatos, California." Page 28: Add: "Bellarmine College, (Philosophate), Plattsburg, N. Y., Telephone Plattsburg 600, Rev. Thomas E. Henneberry, S.J., Rector, Rev. Ralph O. Dates, S.J., Dean." Page 28: *St. Louis University*, Rev. George P. Klubertanz, S.J., Acting Dean of Faculty of Philosophy. Page 28: *St. Mary's College*, Rev. Francis P. Furlong, S.J., Rector. Page 28: *Woodstock College*, delete "Rev. Ralph O. Dates, S.J., Dean of Faculty of Philosophy." Page 29: add: "Jesuit Novitiate, R. No. 1, Oshkosh, Wisc., Rev. Joseph A. Gschwend, S.J., Master of Novices; Rev. Joseph D. Sheehan, S.J., Socius to Master of Novices." Page 29: *Milford Novitiate*, Rev. Edward E. Cinkoski, S.J., Socius to Master of Novices. Page 29: *St. Andrew-on-Hudson*, Rev. Edwin D. Cuffe, S.J., Dean of Juniorate; Rev. Robert J. Boyle, S.J., Socius to Master of Novices. Page 29: *St. Stanislaus Seminary*, Rev. Joseph P. Fisher, S.J., Master of Novices; Rev. Francis J. Guentner, S.J., Socius to Master of Novices for Scholastics. Page 31: *Berchman's College*, Yangchow (Occupied by Communists); *Ricci College*, Nanking (Occupied by Communists); *Kbrist Raja High School*, Rev. Ignatius I. Velleringatt, S.J.; *St. Xavier's High School*, Jaipur City.

Page 32: *Ateneo de Cagayan*, Cagayan de Oro City, Misamis Oriental, Philippines add also Rev. Antonio Camins, S.J., Prefect of Discipline; *Ateneo de Davao*, Rev. Martin J. Casey, S.J., replaces Rev. Theodore E. Daigler, S.J.; *Ateneo de Manila*, 406 Padre Faura, Rev. Nicholas A. Kunkel, S.J., Dean, Graduate School; add Rev. Grant A. Quinn, S.J., Prefect of Discipline. Page 33: *Sacred Heart Novitiate*, Rev. William L. Hayes, S.J., Rector; Rev. Denis F. Lynch, S.J., Master of Novices; Rev. Miguel A. Bernad, S.J., Juniorate Prefect of Studies. Page 33: *St. Joseph's High School*, Rev. Jaime S. Neri, S.J., Director. Page 34: Jesuit Theologates and Philosophates . . . 9; Novitiates and Juniorates . . . 9; Total Schools in United States . . . 98; Total United States and Foreign Schools . . . 143.

HIGH SCHOOLS

KNOW ENGLISH CONTEST: In a contest conducted by the Catholic Classical Association held at Fordham University, May 16, 1952, Brooklyn Preparatory School won the team trophy against eight finalists from the New England Section of the Association and two other finalists from the New York section. The contest, as its name indicates, is a means of achieving better knowledge of our idiom by a better knowledge of the Latin derivatives from which over 75 per cent of our current speech is drawn. Over a two year period 133 Catholic, public and private schools competed in the preliminary contests. The prestige of the Contest has been enhanced by the patronage of Cardinal Spellman and the presence of outstanding classicists and distinguished personages on the boards of judges.

CHRISTOPHER ESSAY CONTEST winner was Ned Walsh of Loyola (Los Angeles) High School receiving a \$500 cash prize.

CHEVERUS HIGH SCHOOL teachers moved into their brand new school building April 21st.

SCOOP: Before Ty Cobb gave his controversial interview to *Life*, he gave Bellarmine (San Jose) *The Cardinal* his only published "All-Time Baseball Team" lineup.

UNIQUE SCHOLARSHIP at St. Ignatius (Chicago) High School is offered to the student of the school rating highest in the Interscholastic Latin Contest and among the ten top contestants.

SCHOLARSHIPS: 160 Seniors were graduated from Canisius High School in June. The scholarship awards to members of the graduating class were as follows: Three full and four half scholarships to Canisius College; four New York State Regents Scholarships; one full scholar-

ship to Le Moyne; two N.R.O.T.C. scholarships; a one-year award from M.I.T. and a tuition scholarship to Georgetown Univ. Albert Karnath, who attained the highest average for the four years of high school, won four-year scholarships to Holy Cross, and M.I.T. in addition to a State Regents Scholarship and one-year awards from Marquette Univ., R.P.I. and Carnegie Tech.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

ALCOHOLISM AS A COLLEGE COURSE: In perhaps the first undergraduate course of its kind, Seattle University, under the direction of Father James E. Royce, offers a course in alcoholism. Purely academic in its intent and restricted to college juniors and seniors preparing for professional work in the problem, the course has been adjudged by two national experts as the finest of its kind in the country at the undergraduate level.

REVIVING AN OLD JESUIT TRADITION, Canisius College held a public defense of all Scholastic Philosophy by two seniors.

CLASSICS CONTEST: Winners of four annual national contests sponsored by Eta Sigma Phi, honorary classical fraternity for college undergraduates are: John J. Keaney of Boston College, 3rd annual Greek Translation Contest; Ireneanne Walter of Saint Louis University, 7th annual Essay Contest; Martin E. Palmer of Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass., 2nd Satterfield Latin Version Contest; and Charles R. Beye of Epsilon chapter at the State University of Iowa, Iowa City, the Chapter Language Census.

"PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH NOTES": Much valuable research never appears in print despite its interest and utility. The University of Detroit has attempted to make such data available to readers in its mimeographed "Psychological Research Notes" which appear at irregular intervals.

VOCATIONS: Fathers B. J. Murray and Ervin Stauffen have compiled statistics on religious and priestly vocations from Regis College and High School, Denver. One hundred and twelve of the alumni are diocesan priests, of whom 81 serve the Denver archdiocese: 130 graduates are religious priests, with 108 of these in the Society of Jesus. Two Bishops and 13 Monsignori have come out of Regis, together with three vocations to the brotherhood. During the past year, 20 former Regis students entered various seminaries.

FLOOD: During the recent flood which threatened Omaha, Creighton faculty and some 950 students worked on the dikes. The gymnasium housed some 150 refugees.

PESCH'S ECONOMICS: *The Economics of Heinrich Pesch*, by Father Richard E. Mulcahy (U. of San Francisco) is the first presentation of Pesch's relatively unexplored economic theory and related philosophic framework to the English speaking world.

OVER TWENTY-ONE of this year's Holy Cross graduating class responded to priestly or religious vocations.

MEDICAL EXAMS: Georgetown senior medical students placed 5 of 10 highest grades in the second part of the National Board examinations.

MONEY MARKETEERS THESIS PRIZE was awarded Father Raymond R. Walter (New York Prov.) for the best thesis in the field of finance by the graduate school of business administration of New York University.

FORD FOUNDATION FELLOWSHIP was awarded Dr. Vincent McBrien of Holy Cross. He is one of 264 teachers in the nation awarded fellowships. He plans to do a year's work in algebraic geometry at Harvard.

SCHOLARSHIP: Father Albert S. Foley, of the Institute of Social Order, Saint Louis University, has been awarded a post-doctoral fellowship by the Carnegie Corporation for a year's study in group dynamics. The fellowship is valued at \$3000.

THE CLEVELAND FOUNDATION recently made a grant to John Carroll University of \$1,075 from the Frederic M. and Nettie E. Backus Memorial Fund for the purchase of a dual channel oscillograph to be used in research concerned with vibration analysis and for other purposes.

JOURNALISM SCHOLARSHIP: Robert Monagle, a 1950 graduate of the Marquette University College of Journalism has been awarded the *Catholic Digest* scholarship of \$750 for advanced study in journalism at Marquette for the school year 1952-53.

ENGLISH TEXTBOOKS: Two books, "Reading for Understanding," and "Integrated Freshman English," both by Saint Louis University faculty members, have been published by Rinehart and Company. "Reading for Understanding" was written by the Rev. Maurice B. McNamee, S.J., assistant professor of English at the University. "Integrated Freshman English" is the work of Joseph A. Rogers, instructor in English. Both books have been used in experimental editions in ten universities around the country for the last two years.

"A LETTER FROM HOME" by Father Laurence J. McGinley, President of Fordham University, is an informal, attractive and very readable brochure of an address to the Fordham Alumni Association.

BUILDING: Two new dormitories are being planned for Holy Cross College.

MEETINGS ATTENDED

THE SOUTHWEST REGIONAL UNIT of the N.C.E.A. elected Father Charles Casassa its President.

FATHER ALEXIS MEI was elected Fellow of the California Academy of Science.

FATHER W. C. DOYLE (Rockhurst College) was elected secretary-treasurer of the Delta Epsilon Sigma honor society of graduates of Catholic Colleges and universities.

FATHER VINCENT HERR was leader of a panel discussion on Social Psychology at the Spring convention of the Illinois Psychological Association.

FATHER JOHN S. CREAGHAN (Georgetown U.) was elected to the Executive Committee of the American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece.

MR. EDWARD P. VONDER HAAR, director of public relations at Xavier University, also president of the American college Public Relations Associations, was one of the featured speakers at the National Convention of the American Alumni Council, Sun Valley, Idaho, July 17, 1952.

FATHER T. EVERETT McPEAKE is a member of the Steering Committee of the Connecticut Council on Teacher Education. The Council consists of representatives of the State Department of Education, teacher training institutions, teacher organizations, and lay educational groups.

FATHER PAUL C. REINERT, president of Saint Louis University, has been elected to the Board of Review of the Commission on Colleges and Universities, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

FATHER CLEMENT REGIMBAL has been named on the steering committee of the Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education.

FATHER ARTHUR DUSSAULT has been named on the board of directors of the American College Public Relations Association as well as renamed vice-president of the Spokane Boys' and Girls' Week Federation board.

FATHER A. TOURIGNY is the new president of the Northwest American Catholic Philosophical Association elected at the conference held recently at Gonzaga.

FATHER JAMES B. MACELWANE, dean of Saint Louis University Institute of Technology, took part in an international symposium on Microseisms, under the auspices of the National Research Council, Sept. 4-6 at Arden House near Harriman, N. Y.

FATHER PAUL C. REINERT, president of Saint Louis University, has been appointed to a newly-constituted National Advisory Committee on Civil Defense Training and Education by the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

ATTENDING the New England Political Science Convention at Harvard, May 3, Fathers George Higgins, Thomas Fleming (elected to the 1952-53 Executive Committee) and James L. Burke.

MISCELLANEOUS

HIGH SCHOOL at Truk in the Carolines for young natives will soon be a reality! A Japanese radio station built during the war on Mission property has been turned over to the Caroline-Marshall Mission by the Government. Substantial buildings, in adequate condition, have thus been supplied for the first high school for boys. Bishop Feeney and the Fathers and Brothers at Truk are now working to prepare these buildings for use. Complete sets of high school texts, all items of high school equipment are needed.

FIFTY DIOCESES and thirty Religious and Missionary organizations have candidates now preparing for the priesthood who received their classical foundation at the School of St. Philip Neri. One of the first graduates will be ordained this year.

MORAL BOOKS: A recent survey made at St. Mary's College indicates that Noldin, *Summa Theologiae Moralis* is the principal moral textbook used in 44 out of 79 seminaries of the country. Fifty-two of the 79 seminaries use texts written by Jesuits.

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL TRADITION

"So much is heard today of the value of the Western heritage in the preservation of our freedoms. American educators shout from their rostra on the mission of the American college to transmit to their students the heritage of this Western culture. What institution of learning is in a better position to pass on this tradition than our own Alma Mater? The Jesuits live and breathe this tradition. They dedicate their lives to inculcating it into the minds of their pupils. The very aim of their institutions of higher learning as well as of their secondary schools is to suffuse the warp and woof of the intellectual fabric of their students with an appreciation and the deep conviction of the dignity of man. All the cultural sources of Western civilization—philosophy, theology, history, literature—are brought to bear in a convergence on the minds of the students to form this central idea of Christian Western culture.

"The Jesuit colleges were started at the height of the Renaissance of Greek and Roman literature. The glorious fruits of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries in philosophical and theological speculation were the food that fed their intellects. Tremendous are their contributions to political science, in the works of Bellarmine and Suarez, upon which our American constitution was built.

"They were equally impregnated with the American ideal as expressed in the Declaration of Independence. As one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, we refer with pride to Charles Carroll of Carrollton, a relative of Archbishop Carroll who founded Georgetown. Gathering together all these currents through which the tradition of Christian Western civilization flowed we can easily see what a mighty river they formed upon which the sturdy ship of Jesuit education was firmly launched in this country.

"Looking back, though, it is easy to appreciate that the Jesuits had a mighty task before them. It is one thing to have a depository of the learning of Western culture. It is another thing, however, to shape that learning into an educational system. Jesuits have been practical men. No program of education can be constructed by a mere blueprint on paper. It requires testing. There must be continual appraisal of its results in terms of the student development. More than two hundred years of tedious detail work were required to produce the Ratio Studiorum, that system of principles, methods and material which constitutes the basic program of Jesuit education.

*Address by Senator Herbert R. O'Connor
Loyola College Alumni Centennial Banquet
Evergreen—Baltimore, Maryland.*



BOSTON COLLEGE



3 9031 033 36146 0

251479

